

THE
Anti-Slavery Reporter.

Published under the sanction of the
British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

Series 4.
Vol. XVIII., No. 3.

JULY-AUGUST, 1898.

{ PRICE 2/6 PER ANNUM.
{ GRATIS TO SUBSCRIBERS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR AND PEMBA—	
CRITICISMS ON OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE, <i>AFRICA</i>	
No. 6, 1898	131-136
SIR A. HARDINGE TO LORD SALISBURY	136-144
LORD SALISBURY'S REPLY	144-152
FURTHER DESPATCHES	153-163
WHAT THE PRESS SAYS	163-182
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE: SLAVERY ON THE MAINLAND. 183-189	
ILLNESS OF THE PRESIDENT	134
SIR MARTIN GOSSELIN	152
THE AFRICAN ASSOCIATION	182
SLAVE-TRADE ON THE ARABIAN COAST	190
NIGER TERRITORY: SLAVE-RAIDERS PUNISHED... ..	192
BANANI	192

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY,

55, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by L. E. NEWNHAM & Co., 12, Finsbury Street, Moorgate, E.C.

1898.

The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

PATRON

1884 H.R.H. The PRINCE of WALES.

PRESIDENT.

1882 ARTHUR PEASE, Esq., M.P.

VICE-PRESIDENT.

1884 SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Bart., K.C.M.G.

TREASURER.

1870 JOSEPH ALLEN, Esq.

COMMITTEE.

1870 ARTHUR ALBRIGHT, Esq.
1877 J. G. ALEXANDER, Esq., LL.B.
1885 W. WILBERFORCE BAYNES, Esq.
1887 J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
1894 E. WRIGHT BROOKS, Esq.
1893 CEPHAS BUTLER, Esq.
1889 SYDNEY BUXTON, Esq., M.P.
1893 JOEL CADBURY, Esq.
1893 FREDERICK CASH, Esq.
1876 JAMES CLARK, Esq.
1880 J. V. CRAWFORD, Esq., late Consul in Cuba.
1884 DR. R. N. CUST, F.R.G.S.
1884 R. W. FELKIN, Esq., M.D., F.R.G.S.
1885 SIR FREDERIC GOLDSMID, K.C.S.I.
1886 HENRY GURNEY, Esq.
1887 D. HACK, Esq.

1884 CALEB R. KEMP, Esq.
1895 CAPTAIN H. NEEDHAM KNOX, R.N.
1893 J. H. LLOYD, Esq.
1895 DONALD MACKENZIE, Esq.
1894 W. CAREY MORGAN, Esq.
1893 JOHN MORLAND, Esq.
1886 ALFRED E. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
1893 JOSEPH A. PEASE, Esq., M.P.
1884 ARNOLD PYE-SMITH, Esq.
1885 FRANCIS RECKITT, Esq.
1894 RICHARD SHORE, Esq.
1870 REV. J. O. WHITEHOUSE.
1885 W. H. WYLDE, Esq., C.M.G. (late of the
Foreign Office *Slave-Trade Department*).
1895 T. GRAHAM YOUNG, Esq.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

RIGHT REV. BISHOP TUCKER, Mombasa.
G. T. ABRINES, Esq., Tangier, Morocco.
FRANK ALLEN, Esq., Alexandria.
B. R. BALFOUR, Esq., Drogheda.
T. H. BARKER, Esq., Liverpool.
THEODORE BURTT, Esq., Pemba.
HON. AND REV. H. CLARK, Jamaica.
PROFESSOR E. DESCAMPS, Louvain.
WILLIAM HARVEY, Esq., Leeds.
CAPTAIN E. C. HORE, South Seas.
G. P. HUNOT, Esq., British Vice-Consul, Saffee.
MONS. HIPPOLYTE LAROCHE, Paris, Ancien
Résident Général de France, Madagascar.
NOEL TEMPLE MOORE, Esq., C.M.G., H.B.M.
Consul-General Tripoli.
A. J. MORASSO, Esq., Tangier.

WILLIAM MORGAN, Esq., Shawford.
G. MOYNIER, Esq., Geneva.
SENHOR JOAQUIM NABUCO, Brazil.
PROF. EDOUARD NAVILLE, Geneva.
REV. PÈRE OHRWALDER, Cairo.
DR. PRUEN, Cheltenham.
COMTE DE ST. GEORGE, Geneva.
DR. G. SCHWEINFURTH, Cairo.
REV. W. G. SHELLABEAR, Singapore.
SLATIN PASHA, Cairo.
M. LE COMTE D'URSEL, Brussels.
M. COURTOIS DE VICOSE, Toulouse.
W. J. WILSON, Esq., Cairo.
COLONEL WINGATE, R.E., C.B. Cairo.
A. B. WYLDE, Esq.

SECRETARY.

1870 CHARLES H. ALLEN, F.R.G.S.

Bankers: Messrs. BARCLAY & Co., 54, Lombard Street.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

JULY—AUGUST, 1898.

[The Editor, whilst grateful to all correspondents who may be kind enough to furnish him with information, desires to state that he is not responsible for the views stated by them, nor for quotations which may be inserted from other journals. The object of the REPORTER is to spread information, and articles are necessarily quoted which may contain views or statements for which their authors can alone be held responsible.]

Africa No. 6 (1898).

Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba.

CORRESPONDENCE PRESENTED TO PARLIAMENT,
JULY, 1898.

BEFORE Parliament rose for the Whitsuntide holiday it was announced that papers had arrived from Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE respecting abolition in Zanzibar and Pemba—indeed, we received a note from the Foreign Office, dated May 17th, inclosing an extract from one of these despatches, and the Government promised to lay the papers on the table soon after the House again met, early in June. This promise was not kept, but in the meantime the MARQUIS OF SALISBURY addressed a long despatch to Sir A. HARDINGE, dated 29th June, which is included in Africa No. 6. What we complain of is that this paper, which only required Lord SALISBURY'S letter of that date, was not made public until Saturday, 23rd July, thus effectually precluding any effective discussion in Parliament when the close of the session was being hurried forward—a very skilful manœuvre on the part of the Government—but unfair to the public, seeing that the holiday season has now set in, and the whole matter has necessarily received but slight attention from the Press or the people.

The paper now under review, consisting of eighty-six pages, contains thirty-four letters and despatches, exclusive of enclosures, dating from November 14th, 1896, to June 29th, 1898, and contains interesting and important matter, though we are sorry to say it abounds in personalities to an extent we never before saw in any documents issued by the Foreign Office. The well-known ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which commenced its work in 1787 against the Slave-trade, and has carried it

on against Slavery until the present day, has incurred the wrath of the officials in Zanzibar—a proof that its existence is as much required now as it was in the days when CLARKSON, WILBERFORCE, and BUXTON stood up so bravely against the pro-Slavery party, whose representatives are even now far more active than is generally supposed.

It is unfortunate, too, that, owing to the well-known views of Sir A. HARDINGE, Her Majesty's Representative at Zanzibar, who makes no secret of his sympathy with the Slave-holders rather than with the Slaves, an uncomfortable feeling has arisen between Her Majesty's Representatives and Officials and that very estimable body the Friends' Industrial Mission at Pemba. It is quite possible that Mr. THEODORE BURTT may in certain instances have been somewhat deceived by his interpreter, who has been since dismissed, but we think that great allowance must be made for a man so imbued with anti-Slavery feeling as Mr. BURTT when he found himself in an official atmosphere in which that natural element of an Englishman's birthright seemed so conspicuously absent. Surely Mr. Commissioner FARLER gives away his case when he writes (on page 58), in the following strong language, which contains a veiled threat, involving the safety of the missionaries' lives:—

Unfair Action of the Quaker Missionaries.

“But the Arabs bitterly resent the intrusion of the Quaker missionaries, whom they charge with acting unfairly, going far beyond the Decree in their action. They say, ‘These men without manners, in a most arrogant and insulting way, act as though the Decree had proclaimed the immediate abolition of Slavery, and the freeing of all the Slaves, and, having bought a large *shamba*, needing much labour to keep it in order, which they cannot get in a fair way, they rob us of our labour for their own profit, and encourage our men to come to them, and thus they get plenty of cheap labour.’

“This action of the Quakers has aroused a strong feeling of hatred and antagonism against them, and if, in desperation, the Arabs do rise, it will go hard with them.”

Mr. FARLER also makes a great mistake in speaking bitterly of “a rich mission” raising the price of labour, which, as abolition has only just commenced, can scarcely be said to have been fixed; it is well known that the Mission is supported entirely by the voluntary contributions of a small, but important, religious body in the United Kingdom, and to compare their wealth with that of the Zanzibar Government, backed as it is by the Government at home, is an absurdity which must be apparent to all those who do not possess the official mind. He says:

"A rich mission, with plenty of money to waste, and willing to pay considerably above the market price of labour, can at any time command plenty of labour, and thus certain people here plume themselves that they have no difficulty in obtaining labour. Of course not; but what about the unfortunate owner of property who has no committee behind him with unlimited funds, who can barely get a living out of his plantation by paying the lowest market rate of wages, what is he to do?" (*Page 61.*)

For the Good of the Slaves themselves.

"But even more, for the moral and general benefit of the Slaves themselves it is necessary for the edicts of the Decree to work slowly."

This kind of reasoning appears, however, to be good enough for Lord SALISBURY, as it draws from him the following extraordinary remark, which will be found in its place in his despatch:—

"On the other hand, it seems to be anticipated that the attitude of the Friends' Mission in the island of Pemba may, by precipitating claims for freedom on the part of the Slaves, and consequently for compensation on the part of the masters, impose a heavier burden upon the Government in the near future. The experience of the forthcoming year will enable a more reliable judgment to be formed upon this point, and will place Her Majesty's Government in a better position for deciding whether any, and, if so, what, assistance shall be tendered by them to the Government of the SULTAN." (*Page 86.*)

Possibly Lord SALISBURY's complaint that the attitude of the Friends may "precipitate claims for freedom," was called forth by Mr. FARLER's statement, printed just above, that it is necessary for the Slaves themselves that the edicts of the Decree should work slowly. This argument, which has been repeated again and again in these despatches, is perfectly new to us, and was certainly not employed in the abolition of the legal status of Slavery declared in India in 1843, nor in any subsequent similar Decrees.

As we stated at the time of its publication, this Zanzibar Proclamation is different from any that has been made by Great Britain or any other country, being hampered with clauses which, as we stated more than a year ago, must necessarily render its working so slow that not many of the Slaves will be left alive to witness the completion of its work.

The question of the reproduction in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* of a photograph of Slaves in chains, which appeared in the *Illustrated London News* of September 5th, 1896, occupies a place in the correspondence now under review, as Mr. Vice-Consul BASIL CAVE states that he has discovered the original in the shop of a Goanese photographer in

Zanzibar, just eighteen months after the original was supplied to the *Illustrated London News*, and it appears that these Slaves were photographed on German territory. Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE, however who was the first Englishman to open up the island of Pemba as Special Commissioner from the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, informs us that in 1895 he almost daily saw *women* Slaves chained together in gangs, guarded by an askari, in the streets of Zanzibar, and although it is unfortunate that the *Illustrated London News* and ourselves were in this instance imposed upon, he thinks that it has no real bearing upon the great question at issue, viz., the carrying out of the abolition Decree of 1897. We apologised in our last number of the *Reporter* for having used this block under a misapprehension, and although the matter was considered by the *Times* of sufficient importance to be embodied in its leading article in the form of a pretty severe rebuke, we think there is now no occasion to carry the subject any farther. The other photograph on the leaflet, of women Slaves in chains in Pemba, is acknowledged to be genuine, by General Sir LLOYD MATHEWS himself. (*Page 43.*)

It will be noted that the SULTAN'S Prime Minister readily finds an excuse for this in the absence of the Wali, whose office was temporarily filled by his brother. No excuse is allowed for the deception practised on the *Illustrated London News* by a Goanese photographer, but on the contrary all the blame is transferred to the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Illness of the President.

As we go to press we grieve to hear that Mr. ARTHUR PEASE, M.P., who has been President of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY since July, 1882, is lying seriously ill at a hotel in Callington, Cornwall, and though the latest reports are very discouraging, we trust that the attack may even yet yield to treatment, and that his restoration to health may, under God's blessing, be secured.

Africa No. 6 (1898).

SIR ARTHUR H. HARDINGE

TO

THE MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, *pages* 68-79,

AND

HIS LORDSHIP'S REPLY, JUNE 29, *pages* 82-86.

As many of our readers may not care to wade through the eighty-six pages in *Africa No. 6*, devoted, as so many of them are, to an elaborate defence of Slavery, and to the necessity of proceeding with the utmost caution, and with a slowness compared with which the tortoise becomes the hare, we make no excuse for printing consecutively the long despatch from H. M. Consul-General in Zanzibar, Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, of 23rd of April, and the long and sympathetic reply from the MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, dated 29th of June last.

We could not find room for the whole of Sir ARTHUR'S despatch, but that of the Foreign Secretary is printed in full.

COMPENSATION. This is the crux of the whole situation, and has produced all the difficulties that stand in the way of *the abolition of the legal status of Slavery*—a phrase not yet “understood of the people” either at home or in the land of the Slave.

Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE admits, page 74, that “the effect of the grant of compensation has undoubtedly been to render the operation of the Decree more gradual than would otherwise have been the case.”

So says Mr. FARLER, page 61, where he argues the case through half a page, but as the unfortunate Quakers, like Charles the First's head, crop up in the middle of it, we gave it up in despair.

Mr. LAST, too—another Anglo-Zanzibaree Commissioner—says on page 52: “It now remains to be shown that it is necessary that the edicts of the Decree should be allowed to work slowly.”

Mr. LAST then proceeds to argue the case through nearly three pages (*a*) on account of the masters; (*b*) for the moral and general benefit of the Slave; and (*c*) for the sake of the plantations and the prosperity of the country generally.

The argument is well worked out, and is no doubt accepted as perfect by those who accept compensation as the panacea for every evil connected with the unholy traffic in human beings.

Lord SALISBURY swallows the whole of the slow progress theory without wincing, but it draws from him an argument against all attempt to accelerate the pace which we feel certain no Prime Minister of England has ever before ventured to put in print.

On *page 86*, near the conclusion of his despatch heartily approving the letters and enclosures contained in *Africa No. 6*, he gives a warning to those who want greater speed ; first of all to the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY at home, and next, to the " Friends' Mission " abroad, whose attitude, it seems to be anticipated, in the island of Pemba, " may, by precipitating claims for freedom on the part of the Slaves, and consequently for compensation on the part of the masters, impose a heavier burden upon the Government in the near future."

The true reason of the slow progression comes out at last. Compensation has to be paid. Neither Zanzibar nor England want to find the money, therefore, let the chariot wheels of the car of freedom drag slowly, please. The ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has always opposed compensation, and it will continue to do so with more fervour than ever now that it has so much practical proof how badly it works, and in this, if we mistake not, the Friends' Industrial Mission to Pemba will heartily join, vague threats notwithstanding.

No. 29.

SIR A. HARDINGE TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—(*Received May 17.*)

ZANZIBAR,

April 23, 1898.

(*Extract.*)

I have the honour, in obedience to the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch on the 31st December, 1897, to submit a report on the working of the Decree of the 1st of Zilkada, 1315 (6th April, 1897), abolishing the legal status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. As a little over a year has now elapsed since the publication of the Decree, the moment seems a specially suitable one for reviewing its effects.

Number of Slaves Freed.

Two thousand Slaves have obtained their freedom in consequence of the Decree, and 2,278 more have, without claiming papers of freedom, made contracts with their masters as free labourers.

These, although they have not been formally registered as freemen, and have not formed the subject of any claim to compensation, have now ceased for all intents and purposes to be Slaves, so that if they are added to those who have received actual letters of emancipation, and have in most cases severed their connection with their former owners, the total number who have taken advantage in one form or another of the Decree is 4,278, distributed in the following proportions between the two islands, viz. : Zanzibar, 3,245 ; Pemba, 1,033.

Total for both Islands :—

Received or on point of receiving freedom papers...	2,000
Contracted as free labourers without applying to Courts for freedom papers ...					2,278
					<hr/>
Total	4,278
					<hr/>

Compensation.

The sums awarded in compensation amount to :—

							RUPEES.
In Zanzibar	12,017
In Pemba	4,330
							<hr/>
Total	16,347
							<hr/>

Or (taking the Rupee at 16 to the £), £1,043.

The average amount granted per Slave has been 60 rupees, or between £3 and £4.

In looking over Mr. FARLER'S books in Pemba the other day, I noticed occasional cases of 80 rupees, and one or two of 20 rupees only.

In one or two cases in Zanzibar 100 rupees, and in one 150 rupees, were awarded.

Assuming, therefore, compensation to have been given only for Slaves freed by the Courts, whose total number is 707, it would appear to have been granted in about 300 cases, or less than half of those which came before the Courts. The latter have not, of course, taken the extreme view of the Anti-Slavery Society that those only are legal Slaves who can be shown to have been born in the Islands or introduced before 1873, but have recognized the rights of innocent purchasers or heirs who brought or inherited Slaves without guilty knowledge of, or complicity in, their original illegal introduction. [Why have they not taken the "extreme view" ?]

The Treaty of 1873, though it bound the SULTAN to prohibit the introduction of Slaves, did not say that such Slaves once introduced became *ipso facto* free, whilst the Supplementary Treaty of 1875 allowed the introduction of "domestic Slaves," who, once introduced, were legitimate subjects of sale, inheritance, or gift, and only provided for their being freed, if "detained on board the ship conveying them, against their will."

[This appears to us to be rather stretching a point, for though we do not profess to be lawyers, we believe that where smuggled goods, *e.g.*, tobacco, have been discovered after having been landed, they are not only seized, but the smuggler is punished in this country. Surely, if Slaves are discovered in Zanzibar or Pemba, who have been smuggled into the Island since the Treaty of 1873, not only should they be entitled to their freedom, but the smuggler, if caught, ought to be punished. The Supplementary Treaty appears to apply only to those "domestic Slaves" or sailors on board ships touching at the Islands, whose presence on board should not cause the condemnation of the vessel. Not being raw Slaves they would presumably have been enslaved prior to 1873.]

Relations of Master and Slave (page 71).

[Sir A. HARDINGE considers that the purport of the Decree of 1897 is now thoroughly understood throughout the islands, and that as a rule the Slaves who accept the offer of having three days a week to work for themselves do not at all care about having their freedom. Still, he admits there are two sides to the question.]

He then continues (page 72)—

° ° The town Slaves as a class are a good deal more intelligent, and it is from their ranks that the great majority of the applicants for freedom in the Island of Zanzibar have come. Yet though every Slave in the city of Zanzibar is aware that he can obtain his freedom for the asking, by simply going to Mr. ALEXANDER, who issues letters of emancipation on behalf of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, the numbers who have actually claimed it have fallen far short of my anticipation.

Scarcely any of the Slaves of the wealthier class of Arabs living in the capital such as the Princes of the Royal family, or the great native magnates like ABDULLAH-BIN-SELAAM, TIPPOO TIB, etc., have done so. The reason for this I believe to be that these Slaves when they actually live in the wealthy city Arab's household are better clothed and fed, and lead an easier and more luxurious life than the poorer class of freemen, and that, even when they live outside the household as day labourers, or as servants of Europeans, paying a portion of their earnings to their master, they liked to think that when disabled by sickness or out of work they can fall back upon their master's house as a home, and that, come what may, he will never let them starve. ° °

2. Effect of the Decree on the Slave population.

The earlier reports I have forwarded to your Lordship on this subject leave no doubt that whilst the masters have, as was foreseen to be inevitable, been placed by the Decree in a somewhat disadvantageous position, the Slaves have, as a whole, greatly gained by it, and are now, in relation to their wants, in a situation which the proletariat of most European States would regard with envy.

A six hours' day for four days in the week in return for an allotment of several acres of good land, freedom from taxation in every form, from military service, from the fear of the workhouse in old age, and from all the numerous cares and burdens, direct or indirect, which weigh upon the European labourer, combine to make their lot a very easy one, and if the names of Slave and Slavery still survive in the common parlance of the people, the institution itself, long moribund, is, as a reality, completely dead.

In the case of many of the Slaves who worked away from their masters in the houses and shops of Indians, the change has not made so much difference as to those who carry on independent trades of their own, as fishermen, sellers of petty wares produced by them, etc., and can now retain the whole of their wages; for as I reported to your Lordship in my despatch of the 4th July, 1897, the Indian, always ready to turn every new situation to his own profit, has, in many instances, deducted from the wages of his Slave employé the portion which the latter, in the old days of the legal recognition of Slavery, was compelled to pay to his Arab or negro master.

But, reviewed as a whole, it is certain that, from the Slave's point of view, the change has been a great and a beneficial one, and that, even in the few out-of-the-way

corners where its full meaning may be still imperfectly understood, it is realized as effectively protecting him against any cruel or brutal treatment.

3. *Effect of the Decree upon Industry (page 73).*

In the towns the Decree has not perceptibly affected the labour market. At first, as I reported to your Lordship in my despatch of the 4th July, 1897, there was a mutinous spirit displayed among some of the "vibarua" of Zanzibar, somewhat similar to that which the rural landowners are now experiencing, especially in the north of Pemba, and they refused to work or carry out their contracts, on the ground that they were now all free, so much so, that one of the principal English merchants here requested my intervention with the Zanzibar Government. The latter sent out police, the workmen "on strike" were told that they would be punished for breach of contract, and in the presence of this display of firmness on the part of the authorities, the effervescence speedily subsided. It may be hoped that it will be the same in the country districts, but there is this difference, that in the towns the men are paid regular wages by the European or Indians employing them, which, as I have explained, is rarely the case with those working on the shambas of the Arabs, whilst a strike could more easily be dealt with in the narrow area of a town than when spread over a number of scattered and isolated plantations.

The rate of wages, about 10 rupees a month in the towns, and 8 rupees a month in the country for the ordinary eight hours' day, is much the same as during the period anterior to the Decree.

"I am inclined to think," writes a correspondent who has a special knowledge of the subject, "that the Decree has had little effect on the labour market, either as regards wages or the supply of labour.

"Upon the common ordinary Slave, man or woman, it has had the effect of making the individual more lazy and insolent, but he does not care to separate himself from his present attachments.

"I think there is a gradual general tendency towards a demand for a higher rate of wages, but this is owing to the steady advance of civilization and commercial interests and requirements, not to any effect the Decree may have had."

[Then why does Mr. FARLER so bitterly complain (page 61), that the Quakers, "who have plenty of money to waste" (*sic*) are the cause of the demand for a higher rate of wages?

Sir A. HARDINGE'S particular correspondent attributes it to the steady advance of civilisation. Have not the maligned Quakers steadily contributed towards this civilising influence?—*Ed. Reporter.*

Last year's clove crop, which, for causes independent of the Decree, was a very poor one, was not affected by it, for the knowledge that they could not be compelled to work had not yet sufficiently spread among the Slaves to make any perceptible difference in the picking. This year, however, it seems to be generally anticipated that they will have in many places to be induced to pick their master's trees, where the latter are not in a position to offer them payment in money, by a promise of half the crop picked by them.

This means, of course, that the land-owners will only get half the harvest, a

circumstance which will precipitate the bankruptcy of some of them, and, their land being a drug in the market, the conversion of a good many acres now under cultivation into waste land, and will, therefore, indirectly affect, at any rate, for a time, the future revenue and agricultural prosperity of the country.

Compensation (page 74).

The effect of the grant of compensation has undoubtedly been to render the operation of the Decree more gradual than would otherwise have been the case. Had there been no compensation a Slave would not have had to wait to be registered as a freeman until his master's claims to compensation in respect of his services could be investigated, and the process of emancipation would have been far more rapid and simple. It may be doubted, however, whether the delay which the compensation clause entails is not often as beneficial to the Slave as to his former master. A Slave in a moment of pique, or yielding to the sudden impulses to which the African, like a child, is very prone, will frequently run away from his old surroundings, without any very definite idea as to what awaits him in the outer world, and many afterwards have occasion to repent at leisure of the perhaps irrevocable step he has taken in haste, without fully realizing all its consequences. He will hear, for instance, that there is work for him with good wages as a porter on the mainland; without inquiry into its nature, he will, from mere love of change, suddenly sever his ties with his old home, and when afterwards, having spent all his advance of wages in drink, he toils along on the Uganda road with a weight of 60 lbs. on his head, under the strict discipline of an European caravan leader impatient of malingering or idleness, will doubt perhaps whether he was not better off in his own holding on the Zanzibar plantation, and, amidst the dreary steppes of Masailand, sigh regretfully, as does every true Swahili, for the "scent of the cocoa-nuts and the spice trees." The necessity under which he now lies of appearing before the Compensation Courts gives him time to review his position, and to learn from the Magistrate that his freedom does not mean that he can squat where he chooses on his master's land, and at the same time refuse him all payment either in rent, in produce, or in labour. His master, who must also appear there, may hold out to him inducements to return to the land as a free labourer and under better terms than formerly as regards his work and share of profits, and an arrangement may be effected between them, with the friendly assistance of the Court, which need, of course, be only experimental, but which may in the long run prove much more advantageous to him than if he were to be turned loose upon the world.

[We have always maintained that compensation is at the bottom of all the difficulties that have arisen from a proclamation abolishing the legal status of Slavery. No compensation was given in India, and yet millions of Slaves set themselves free without the elaborate system of Courts and the issuing of papers of freedom, as is now required in Zanzibar and Pemba. We stated at the time that this Abolition Decree was different from any other that had ever been issued by Great Britain or any other power, and we are not at all surprised that Sir A. HARDINGE has to confess that, had there been no compensation, "the process of emancipation would have been far more rapid and simple."]

THE FRIENDS' MISSION.

[Here follows a long statement respecting the action of the Friends' Mission in Pemba, which has already occupied considerable space in a former despatch in the same Blue Book. Much blame is attributed to Mr. THEODORE BURTT, but as he is in constant communication with the Friends' Industrial Mission in London, and we have received no letter from him since last October, we cannot be wrong in leaving the explanation of any misunderstanding that may have arisen to Mr. BURTT and the honourable Society which he represents. There is far too much of this personal attack throughout *Africa No. 6*, nor are the "*Friends*" the only ones to draw down the wrath of the pro-Slavery officials in Her Majesty's Protectorate of Zanzibar and Pemba.

The "*anti-Slavery faction*," of which so much complaint is made, includes the old BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, which began its Zanzibar work so long ago as 1871, twenty-seven years; and yet we are told by all the officials the work *must* go slowly! At this pace another century or so will be required.]

Effects of the Decree upon the Slave-trade (page 75).

It was always supposed here that the abolition of the status of Slavery would give a stimulus to the export Slave-trade, as many masters would endeavour to dispose of their Slaves in the Arabian markets, where they would fetch as much as 500 rupees, rather than receive the small compensation of 60 or 70 rupees, which was all they could hope to get from Government.

Special vigilance has accordingly been exercised by the Zanzibar authorities as well as by Her Majesty's ships, particularly at the north end of Pemba, and the precautions imposed by the Brussels Act on the embarkation of negro passengers have been enforced with more rigour than usual. This year, since the south-west monsoon began to break, the number of Arabs proceeding with Slaves to Muscat has been so unusually large as to arouse our suspicions, and in many cases to make us refuse permission to Slaves to accompany their masters to Arabia, even when the Slaves professed themselves desirous and anxious to do so. This may seem an interference with the freedom of the Slaves, but it is idle to treat the African negro as if he were really a full-grown freeman. He is, as one of the greatest of African authorities, Mr. RHODES, has so truly observed, still a child, and both in the matter of his labour and of his freedom to proceed to Slave-trade countries, requires to be treated as a child and protected against himself. It is, moreover, a common trick of the Slave-traders to produce a number of natives, who personate the negro passengers and profess a desire to go to Muscat, and for whom at the last moment an equivalent number of real Slaves are substituted, and thrust, in their ignorance and apathy, into the dhows.

Sir LLOYD MATHEWS has accordingly, with my approval, made a rule that, except in special instances, and where special guarantees are given, no African negro shall

be permitted to proceed in charge of an Arab, or on a native vessel, to Arabia, unless he can show not only that he is willing to go there, but that he can speak or at least has some knowledge of the Arabic language, this being a sure test of his really being, what these negroes are often persuaded by their masters to profess to be, the *bonâ fide* domestic servant of an Arab whose home is in Oman. The import Slave-trade into Zanzibar has long been practically extinct, and has not, therefore, been affected either one way or another by the abolition of the legal status of Slavery.

Forty-three persons have been convicted during the past year of offences connected with the Slave-trade, and have in each case been sentenced to one year's imprisonment with hard labour. Of these, thirty-seven were convicted of kidnapping and six of selling Slaves.

No dhows engaged in the Slave-trade have, so far as I am aware, been captured during the past year in the waters of the Zanzibar Protectorate. At Mombasa, a dhow, the *Fath-el-Rahman*, flying the French flag, was arrested by my orders in September, 1897, on suspicion of having a cargo of kidnapped Slaves on board, and these suspicions being confirmed when the vessel was searched by our police, the captain was duly lodged in prison.

In consequence of a protest by the French Consul against my action, Mr. CAVE was instructed (I being absent at the time in Ukamba) to send the dhow and master to Zanzibar, whence they were sent on for the latter's trial to the French Court at Réunion, with what result I have not yet heard. There has been since the abolition of the legal status a marked increase at all the ports along the coast in the number of dhows flying the French flag, and passages by them are twice as expensive as those asked for the journey to Arabia on an ordinary native vessel.

I ought perhaps before closing this dispatch to refer to two features in the Decree which have given occasion to much adverse criticism, namely, the maintenance of the institution of concubinage and the application of its provisions by native magistrates. [*For this unsavoury subject our readers are referred to the despatch itself.*]

The Walis (page 78).

There are in my opinion two good reasons for allowing the Walis, as the principal native officials, a leading part in the application of the Decree, namely: (1) economy, and (2) regard for native public opinion and native interests. At present we have five Walis, three for Zanzibar and two for Pemba and two English Commissioners, one for Pemba and one for Zanzibar, through whom the Decree is worked. If in place of these five Walis we had five English magistrates, the Zanzibar Government, already heavily burdened by the expenses of the Decree, would be charged with an extra expenditure of very nearly £5,000 more. You can scarcely get a competent English magistrate to reside in an unhealthy tropical island for less than £500 or £600 a year; but his actual salary is only a portion of what he costs. You must provide him in addition to it with a decent house, with a staff of clerks and interpreters, with a boat or a horse to move about his district, with medicines and some provision for medical assistance, and by the time all these needs have been satisfied he will be found to cost nearly, if not more than, £1,000 a year. And when all this has been done he will still have after all to trust for some time to the native officials for his knowledge of the country and people, and the latter will necessarily

be the medium through which he will view many of the problems with which he is called upon to deal. It would, however, not be possible for the Zanzibar Government to provide the sum requisite for so large a European staff, and it must, therefore, perforce, fall back upon the native machinery already available. [*Economy again!*]

In the second place, the maintenance of the old native Executive affords a guarantee to the natives that their interests will receive sympathetic consideration at the hands of the protecting Power, and has rendered the Decree far more acceptable to them than if it had also entailed, in addition to its other features, the supersession of natives by English, of Mussulman by Christian officials. No Government, however strong, can entirely disregard and trample on the public opinion, or even the prejudices of the governed, and laws which may be good in themselves become, in a sense, harsh and unjust once they seem so to the people on whom they are imposed. By associating the principal Arabs with the application of the reform which we have initiated, we have shown our desire to induce them, and through them the leading natives, to co-operate with us, and to identify, so far as we can do so, their interests with ours, whilst the supervision of the English Commissioners, and in the capital of the English officials of the SULTAN'S Government, has checked any disposition on their part to defeat its substantial objects. If in Pemba the two Walis are old-fashioned and conservative, the three Walis of Zanzibar are all young men of modern ideas, so far as these can be apprehended by an Eastern, and sincerely anxious to merit the approval of the SULTAN and Sir LLOYD MATHEWS by carrying out the instructions of the Government. [*Very sophisticated arguments.*]

As Arabs of high rank (those of Mwera and Kokotoni belong to the SULTAN'S tribe, and are closely connected with his house), they have an influence with the natives of all classes, which no English stranger could for some time command, and a knowledge of native customs and native feeling which renders them most useful intermediaries between the European officials of the Protectorate and the subject Mahomedan population. They have so far done their work very well, being well aware of their real interests as servants of the Government, and have constantly used their influence for peace and conciliation between all the various interests and classes affected by the Decree.

Considering it, therefore, as a whole, the Decree has, I think, so far realised the main objects with which it was framed. It has affirmed, and is fast bringing home to the population of the islands the principle for which the House of Commons has contended, of the non-recognition of Slavery, or compulsory service based on the ownership of one man by another, as an institution upheld by the law. By providing compensation for vested rights, guaranteed by an earlier legal system, it has proved to the Arabs that the Government, while strong enough if it pleased to trample on those rights, was desirous of dealing with them in a spirit of equity, and has thus inspired them with a sense of confidence in our justice, and removed, or at least mitigated, feelings of bitterness or resentment on the part of the subject race, which, though impotent for present practical harm, might, nevertheless, have been pregnant with future danger. The checks which its procedure has imposed on precipitate and universal emancipation have often afforded to Slaves and masters alike an opportunity of maturely considering, in a manner which they might not otherwise have been enabled to do, the new situation created by it, and in many cases of readjusting their relations on a sounder foundation without irremediably severing old ties to the detriment of the true interests of both classes. If in some instances it has entailed, as any

be permitted to proceed in charge of an Arab, or on a native vessel, to Arabia, unless he can show not only that he is willing to go there, but that he can speak or at least has some knowledge of the Arabic language, this being a sure test of his really being, what these negroes are often persuaded by their masters to profess to be, the *bonâ fide* domestic servant of an Arab whose home is in Oman. The import Slave-trade into Zanzibar has long been practically extinct, and has not, therefore, been affected either one way or another by the abolition of the legal status of Slavery.

Forty-three persons have been convicted during the past year of offences connected with the Slave-trade, and have in each case been sentenced to one year's imprisonment with hard labour. Of these, thirty-seven were convicted of kidnapping and six of selling Slaves.

No dhows engaged in the Slave-trade have, so far as I am aware, been captured during the past year in the waters of the Zanzibar Protectorate. At Mombasa, a dhow, the *Fath-el-Rahman*, flying the French flag, was arrested by my orders in September, 1897, on suspicion of having a cargo of kidnapped Slaves on board, and these suspicions being confirmed when the vessel was searched by our police, the captain was duly lodged in prison.

In consequence of a protest by the French Consul against my action, Mr. CAVE was instructed (I being absent at the time in Ukamba) to send the dhow and master to Zanzibar, whence they were sent on for the latter's trial to the French Court at Réunion, with what result I have not yet heard. There has been since the abolition of the legal status a marked increase at all the ports along the coast in the number of dhows flying the French flag, and passages by them are twice as expensive as those asked for the journey to Arabia on an ordinary native vessel.

I ought perhaps before closing this dispatch to refer to two features in the Decree which have given occasion to much adverse criticism, namely, the maintenance of the institution of concubinage and the application of its provisions by native magistrates. [*For this unsavoury subject our readers are referred to the despatch itself.*]

The Walis (page 78).

There are in my opinion two good reasons for allowing the Walis, as the principal native officials, a leading part in the application of the Decree, namely: (1) economy, and (2) regard for native public opinion and native interests. At present we have five Walis, three for Zanzibar and two for Pemba and two English Commissioners, one for Pemba and one for Zanzibar, through whom the Decree is worked. If in place of these five Walis we had five English magistrates, the Zanzibar Government, already heavily burdened by the expenses of the Decree, would be charged with an extra expenditure of very nearly £5,000 more. You can scarcely get a competent English magistrate to reside in an unhealthy tropical island for less than £500 or £600 a year; but his actual salary is only a portion of what he costs. You must provide him in addition to it with a decent house, with a staff of clerks and interpreters, with a boat or a horse to move about his district, with medicines and some provision for medical assistance, and by the time all these needs have been satisfied he will be found to cost nearly, if not more than, £1,000 a year. And when all this has been done he will still have after all to trust for some time to the native officials for his knowledge of the country and people, and the latter will necessarily

be the medium through which he will view many of the problems with which he is called upon to deal. It would, however, not be possible for the Zanzibar Government to provide the sum requisite for so large a European staff, and it must, therefore, perforce, fall back upon the native machinery already available. [*Economy again!*]

In the second place, the maintenance of the old native Executive affords a guarantee to the natives that their interests will receive sympathetic consideration at the hands of the protecting Power, and has rendered the Decree far more acceptable to them than if it had also entailed, in addition to its other features, the supersession of natives by English, of Mussulman by Christian officials. No Government, however strong, can entirely disregard and trample on the public opinion, or even the prejudices of the governed, and laws which may be good in themselves become, in a sense, harsh and unjust once they seem so to the people on whom they are imposed. By associating the principal Arabs with the application of the reform which we have initiated, we have shown our desire to induce them, and through them the leading natives, to co-operate with us, and to identify, so far as we can do so, their interests with ours, whilst the supervision of the English Commissioners, and in the capital of the English officials of the SULTAN'S Government, has checked any disposition on their part to defeat its substantial objects. If in Pemba the two Walis are old-fashioned and conservative, the three Walis of Zanzibar are all young men of modern ideas, so far as these can be apprehended by an Eastern, and sincerely anxious to merit the approval of the SULTAN and Sir LLOYD MATHEWS by carrying out the instructions of the Government. [*Very sophistical arguments.*]

As Arabs of high rank (those of Mwera and Kokotoni belong to the SULTAN'S tribe, and are closely connected with his house), they have an influence with the natives of all classes, which no English stranger could for some time command, and a knowledge of native customs and native feeling which renders them most useful intermediaries between the European officials of the Protectorate and the subject Mahomedan population. They have so far done their work very well, being well aware of their real interests as servants of the Government, and have constantly used their influence for peace and conciliation between all the various interests and classes affected by the Decree.

Considering it, therefore, as a whole, the Decree has, I think, so far realised the main objects with which it was framed. It has affirmed, and is fast bringing home to the population of the islands the principle for which the House of Commons has contended, of the non-recognition of Slavery, or compulsory service based on the ownership of one man by another, as an institution upheld by the law. By providing compensation for vested rights, guaranteed by an earlier legal system, it has proved to the Arabs that the Government, while strong enough if it pleased to trample on those rights, was desirous of dealing with them in a spirit of equity, and has thus inspired them with a sense of confidence in our justice, and removed, or at least mitigated, feelings of bitterness or resentment on the part of the subject race, which, though impotent for present practical harm, might, nevertheless, have been pregnant with future danger. The checks which its procedure has imposed on precipitate and universal emancipation have often afforded to Slaves and masters alike an opportunity of maturely considering, in a manner which they might not otherwise have been enabled to do, the new situation created by it, and in many cases of readjusting their relations on a sounder foundation without irremediably severing old ties to the detriment of the true interests of both classes. If in some instances it has entailed, as any

such radical social change could scarcely fail to do, some suffering and loss to land-owners, and in others has led to local outbreaks of licence and crime, such instances have been fewer than would probably have been the case if the change had not been guided and controlled by experienced native authorities, bent on rendering it as gradual and as painless as possible. It has been, in fact, a reform, but a conservative and cautious reform, of far-reaching ultimate consequences rather than of striking immediate effects, and as such, however unsatisfactory to impatient extremists, is, I venture to submit, in substantial harmony with the genius of the best and wisest English legislation. [*Certainly a most cautious reform.*]

I have asked the Zanzibar Government to supply me with monthly statistical returns which shall illustrate the continuous working of the Decree, and enable me from time to time to report its further developments to your Lordship.

ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

The Reply of the Prime Minister.

WE have already announced that we break the uniformity of dates by printing Lord SALISBURY'S answer to Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE immediately after the despatch of the latter. It will be noticed that the date of the reply is 29th June, but it was not made public until July 23rd, although it might easily have been laid on the Table in one week after it was posted. We scarcely like to think that the Government designedly intended to avoid discussion, yet this has been the effect, for, as Parliament was preparing to rise, and a general stampede had set in, *Africa No. 6*, with its strange theories and its wild accusations, fell flat, and obtained but little notice, even from the Press. Neither have we now any further space to point out the fallacies of this despatch. In the main, it is a recapitulation of what the pro-Consul in Zanzibar has written, and to him the Prime Minister, says "Ditto."

Meanwhile 1,000 Slaves have been set free in Pemba, which is good, *as far as it goes!* Last year, Mr. CURZON asked for a decade, but, at the present rate, he will require nearly ten!

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY TO SIR A. HARDINGE.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 29th*, 1898.

SIR,—During the course of the year which has elapsed since the publication of the SULTAN'S Decree of the 3rd April, 1897, for the abolition of the legal status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, I have received several communications from you with regard to the measures that have been taken for the proper execution of the Decree in those portions of His Highness's dominions. The Report of Mr. O'SULLIVAN, Her Majesty's Vice-Consul in Pemba, which has been published as a Parliamentary Paper,

contains much useful information as to the effects of the Decree during the first six months of its operation in that island. Mr. FARLER, who was appointed Commissioner of the Zanzibar Government for the supervision of the Decree in Pemba, has from time to time forwarded statements through you of the steps that have been taken by him in discharge of the duties of his post. More recently you have transmitted to me special reports drawn up by that gentleman and by Mr. LAST, his colleague in the Island of Zanzibar, at the end of January last, with a covering communication from Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, First Minister of the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR. Finally, in a despatch dated the 23rd April last, you have furnished me with your own observations, surveying the entire first year of the execution of the Decree, and summarizing the results which have so far been obtained. In these various communications, which contain much information of considerable value, Her Majesty's Government feel that they possess material for forming an opinion as to the measure of success which has so far attended the important step of last year, and as to the justice of the criticisms with which, in various quarters, its operation has been assailed.

A reference to my despatch of the 10th February, 1897, which contained the instructions upon which you were to act, would be scarcely necessary, were it not that misapprehension appears subsequently to have grown up in some quarters with regard to the essential features of the scheme therein recommended by Her Majesty's Government.

In view of that misapprehension, and inasmuch as the results even of a single year's proceedings can only be fairly estimated in strict relation to the policy in pursuance of which those proceedings have been undertaken, it may be well, in passing, to recapitulate the essential features of the scheme of 1897, and the grounds for their adoption.

We were dealing with a Moslem population, in which the SULTAN and the most influential class were of Arab race. The sanctions of the Mahomedan religion, joined to the extreme antiquity of the institution of Slavery throughout the East, made the task of dealing with it difficult and to some extent hazardous. Similar obstacles were in former years opposed to any reform of the kind in the case of India. The Indian legislators met the difficulty, in the case of British territory, by measures which, without interfering with the social customs of the people, withdrew from the status of Slavery the sanction and assistance of the law. In the protected States, which were not British territory, and therefore did not come under British legislation, no change was made; except in so far as the Slave-trade was concerned. The legal sanction of Slavery remained where it was before. Zanzibar, in like manner, is not British territory, but is a protected State, in which the executive and judicial administration continue to be intrusted in the main to the hands of native officials. Nevertheless, Her Majesty's Government came to the conclusion that it was open to them to take a step notably in advance of that which was taken in India in dealing with Slavery.

Zanzibar, though a protected State, was treated, not as the protected States of India have been, and are still, treated, but as British Indian territory directly subject to the Crown is treated. As in that territory, the legal status of Slavery has been formally abolished.

They purposely confined the operation of the Decree to the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and did not extend it, at the same time, to the mainland dominions of the SULTAN, because the conditions, both of servile tenure and of the Slave population, in the latter differ materially from, and call less urgently for relief than, those upon the islands; and because the risk of unforeseen consequences was even more considerable in a community but recently included in the British Protectorate, and barely recovered from the shock of internal convulsion.

Many circumstances have combined in recent years to agitate and alarm the Moslem inhabitants of North-Eastern Africa; and the task of suppressing armed resistance, if it should occur, would be much more formidable on the mainland than in the islands.

Her Majesty's Government sanctioned the execution of the Decree upon the islands by the Arab officials of the SULTAN, believing that in this way they were more likely to conciliate native respect, and to win popular acceptance, while greater economy would also be assured, than by introducing an elaborate and highly-paid mechanism of foreign origin; and feeling confident that the supervision of the native Courts by British Commissioners of tried experience and well-known sympathy with the natives, and, lastly, by Sir LLOYD MATHEWS and yourself, would be a sufficient security against lack of vigilance or prejudice.

In the Act of Parliament (3 & 4 Wm. IV., cap. 85) which imposed on the Government of India the duty of extinguishing Slavery in British territory, it is expressly provided that due regard should be paid "to the laws of marriage, and the rights and authorities of fathers and heads of families."

The SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR, in his message to you of the 14th November, 1896, earnestly deprecated any interference with the status of concubines, pointing out that, under the Mahomedan law, they are "practically wives and mothers of their masters' children, sharing equal rights with the children of Arab mothers." He added that "in allowing concubines to leave their masters, Arab homes would be broken up"; and he begged Her Majesty's Government to "keep the Arab homes intact, and to save his people from a fate to which death would almost be preferable." Her Majesty's Government could not fail to pay attention to this appeal, feeling that to overthrow the authority of heads of families, on the pretence that such restraint is Slavery, would have been to give a violent shock to the religious and traditional feelings of the people.

Her Majesty's Government recommended the granting of compensation in cases where the legal ownership of the freed Slave, and damage accruing

to the owner from the loss of his service, could be established to the satisfaction of a competent Court, in view of the solemn promise given by the then SULTAN, on the 1st August, 1890, with the sanction of the British Agent. This course appeared to be demanded no less by the obligations of honour, than by considerations of policy.

The experience of the past year has, on the whole, confirmed the judgment of Her Majesty's Government in these respects ; and they have no intention of urging any departure from the main lines of the policy, which, at their instance, the Zanzibar Government adopted in 1897. In again drawing attention to its cardinal features, I am only anxious to relieve from the possibility of renewed misunderstanding the more detailed examination to which I now turn.

In the first place, I desire to place on record the appreciation entertained by Her Majesty's Government of the manner in which the SULTAN, both by authority and by personal example, has lent his assistance to the proper carrying out of a policy that must, at the outset, have been somewhat distasteful to himself, and to his surroundings. The steps taken by him to publish and proclaim the Decree, to familiarise the leading Arabs with its provisions, and to secure their co-operation in its administration, appear to have been attended with excellent results ; whilst his action in substituting conditions of paid labour, under contract, with his own Slaves, for the servile status in which they were previously employed, set an example at an early and important juncture, which has been wisely followed by many of his leading subjects, and which would seem to be capable of much further extension. You should communicate to His Highness the favourable opinion of Her Majesty's Government as to these proceedings, and encourage him to a continuance of similar activity in the future.

The reports presented by the British authorities in the service of the SULTAN indicate an equal anxiety on their part to carry out with fidelity and discretion the terms of the Decree. Sir LLOYD MATHEWS has voluntarily accepted no small addition to the onerous labours of his position in undertaking the assessment of compensation in cases where the Courts had decided upon its justice ; and although Her Majesty's Government are not acquainted, from the papers now before them, with the exact principles upon which this has been calculated—a point upon which they would be glad to receive further information, and although they observe that it has ranged between widely opposite extremes, they feel assured that the great local knowledge of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS will have resulted in decisions more just than any other system would be likely to have secured. Mr. LAST and Mr. FARLER, the Commissioners appointed by the Zanzibar Government, appear to have entirely merited the confidence which was reposed in them, and Her Majesty's Government regret the attempts, resulting no doubt from ignorance, rather than from any preconceived purpose, which appear to have been made

to weaken Mr. FARLER's position, and to depreciate his services in the island of Pemba. It would be ungenerous not to recognise, in the same context, that the Walis who were appointed by the SULTAN to preside over the native Courts appear, by a consensus of the authorities whose opinion I have received, to have acted with fairness in a position that was not wanting in delicacy or difficulty. This disposition on their part should receive every encouragement, the success of the scheme depending, in the main, upon the confidence entertained by master and Slave alike in the rectitude of the judiciary constituted for the purpose of settling their claims. Nor should any opportunity be missed by the British authorities of stimulating the diligence of the Walis in cases which might otherwise escape their notice.

The feature in the present situation that first challenges attention is the number of the persons who have, during the past year, either applied for and received their freedom, or have voluntarily accepted fresh conditions of service with their former masters. I gather from your report that there have been in the two islands 2,000 of the former, and 2,278 of the latter. These totals, while satisfactory in comparison with the scanty figures that were returned during the first few months of the operation of the Decree, and that excited unfavourable, though perhaps premature, comment in this country, may, at first sight, be considered small in proportion to the entire Slave population of the two islands. The reports, however, that have been submitted to me enable a fair judgment to be formed as to the rate of progress that has been attained, and the following conclusions may be drawn from them.

It was at first widely alleged that the Slaves were unaware, and had even been left intentionally in ignorance, of the existence and terms of the Decree of the 6th April, 1897. There appears to be no foundation for this charge. The facts reported in the papers which will be presented to Parliament convince me that every reasonable measure has been adopted for securing the universal dissemination of the requisite knowledge, and that, with the exception of a few outlying portions of the population, who are difficult of access, there are none, or next to none, of the subjects of the SULTAN on the two islands to whom the substance of the new Decree is not sufficiently known to provoke action on their part, should they be so inclined. It is not to ignorance that any backwardness of movement can fairly be ascribed.

It has also been asserted that the Slaves, from previous experience of the Arab authorities, and from knowledge of their supposed sympathies, have been afraid to apply to the Courts for recognition of their freedom. There is no inherent improbability in such a state of mind in the earlier stages of emancipation, and it may be that, at the start, such apprehensions, in some cases, exercised a deterrent effect. Such a feeling would probably be likely to wear away in proportion as it was proved by experience to be unreasonable or premature, and in the widely-reported attitude of independence, amounting,

in many cases, to unruliness and turbulence, on the part of the newly-freed Slaves, I do not find any suggestion of its protracted continuance. Simultaneously, the energetic action of the SULTAN's Commissioners, and the co-operation of Her Majesty's Consular authorities, in both islands, in assisting the Slaves to a knowledge, and, where called upon, to a vindication of their rights, have done much to mitigate the suspicions of a naturally timid race, and may be expected, as time passes, to remove the last vestiges of a fear for which there is, in the facts of the case, no justification.

It is doubtless, in the main, due to the character of the Slave population, and to the contentment of a large proportion of their number with the conditions of their existing lot, that the more rapid progress expected in some quarters has not been attained. A community which has been for long enslaved, and which has grown up in a social environment where servitude is not merely an immemorial custom, but enjoys the sanction of a religious law, is equally indifferent to the disgrace of the servile status and to the attractions of freedom. It is clear from the accounts submitted to me, that many of the Slaves neither desire nor are willing to take active steps for the assertion of their liberty. This condition of mind is partly attributable to a natural indolence which may be expected in time to diminish, as the consciousness of the range and responsibilities of a free life becomes more common; but it no doubt finds also a powerful ally in the actual circumstances of the Slaves, a fact which throws a favourable light on the manner in which the servile relationship has evidently been interpreted in recent years in the vast majority of cases in the two islands. The bulk of the Slaves are manifestly attached to the soil upon which they and their families have been brought up, and find no hardship in the condition under which, in return for their labour, they are fed and housed, and are supported when sick or incapable. This state of feeling will exist more especially among the two extremes of age, the very old and the very young; but even among those in the prime of life the security of an assured livelihood would appear in a large number of cases to be preferred to the hazards of personal initiative and free competition.

At the same time an acquiescence, however reasonable or widespread, in the *status quo*, would not justify any diminution in the effort to supersede, over as large an area as possible, the conditions of servile labour by those of free labour for a wage. I am glad to learn that the precedent established by the SULTAN in this particular is being increasingly followed; and the features of the revised contracts as reported to me—under which the freed Slave becomes a labourer enjoying an allotment of no mean size in return, working for his master only twenty-four hours in the week, and receiving extra pay for extra work—appear to be both just and benevolent. Her Majesty's Government hope for a continuous development, where the conditions are suitable, of this system.

In another respect the promulgation of the Decree has been attended with

the most advantageous results. Though cruelty was probably not common in the previous relations between master and Slave, it was liable in remote localities to be practised with insufficient fear of detection, while the Slave was constantly exposed to the caprice or the indifference of a master whose rights were enforced by the law. A consensus of opinion testifies to the fact that cases of beating and inhumanity have now almost ceased to occur, and that a much greater indulgence prevails in the treatment of domestic servants and of the labouring classes at large. This change has been accompanied by corresponding improvements in prison and sanitary administration, notably in the towns of the Island of Pemba, where they were most needed, as detailed in the Reports of Mr. Vice-Consul O'SULLIVAN. That even a single year's working of the Decree has resulted in a very sensible improvement in the condition of the population throughout the islands seems to be beyond question.

For these reasons, Her Majesty's Government are not disposed to share the disappointment that has been expressed in some quarters as to the relatively slow rate of progress that is said to have been made. A readjustment, rather than a violent revolution, in the social economy of the islands has always been their object; and the information now before them leads them to think that this is in course of being achieved. They also recognise in the arguments concurrently though independently employed by Mr. LAST and Mr. FARLER, a powerful plea, in the interest of both masters and men, for the prosecution of a moderate rather than a precipitate advance in the future.

An additional reason in favour of gradual methods and the avoidance of precipitate action may be found in the statistics as regards drunkenness, vagrancy, and theft, which are included in your Report and in the information concerning the tendency to idleness of the freed Slaves, to which the Commissioners have drawn attention. Though the number of these cases may not be regarded with any surprise by those who had, from local experience, awaited with some apprehension the prospect of a sudden relaxation of the bonds of compulsory toil, it is sufficient to show that any too sudden letting loose of large numbers of men might be attended with difficulties with which the local police would find it hard to cope. The firm application of the vagrancy laws, and the extension, where possible, of Government works for the unemployed, may, however, enable the SULTAN'S Ministers to deal with any such movement as appears likely, under present circumstances, to occur.

I join with you in deprecating the action taken by the local representative of the Friends' Mission at Banani in Pemba. The evidence which has been furnished in disproof of the charges brought forward by him shows conclusively that those charges were made without sufficient care or inquiry into the facts. The ignorance or the impulsiveness of individual conduct

should not, however, permanently detract from the services which such Missions, if properly conducted, are capable of rendering both to the Government and to the cause which, equally with the Government, they have at heart. It is further to be hoped that the complete refutation of statements too easily accepted and reproduced by important Associations in this country, which these papers record, may not be without effect in producing a more cautious and dispassionate attitude on the part of the representative persons and organs of the Anti-Slavery movement in the future.

A few points remain to be noticed in connection with the local administration of the Decree. I gather that in the earlier stages compensation claims, wherever originated, were commonly referred to the decision of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS at Zanzibar, but that the delays and difficulties of this procedure have led to a subdivision of labour. It is undoubtedly to be desired that each case should, as far as possible, be settled on the spot; and I approve of the decision by which full power of adjudicating upon and settling Pemba cases has been given to the Walis in that island.

Nevertheless, there appears to be a considerable congestion of undecided cases, particularly on the latter island, while a large number of freed Slaves who have not yet received their papers of freedom are employed upon the Government plantation at Tundawa. There are probably compensating advantages in the delay thus caused, both to the masters and the men, as indicated in your Report. But I should be glad if you would further consider the matter, in conjunction with the officials of the SULTAN, and report to me as to any measures that may be found desirable to secure a reasonable acceleration in the final decision of cases already opened.

The registration of Slaves applying for freedom has been made the subject of adverse comment, as imposing an additional delay to the achievement of complete liberty. I understand, however, that the examination of the applicant, and the entry of particulars concerning his or her appearance, are necessary precautions, on the one hand, to prevent the chance of collusion and impersonation; on the other hand, to determine the amount of compensation, if any, that shall be subsequently awarded. Some such safeguards would appear to be desirable to prevent fraud and to ensure justice, but they should be as few and as simple as possible, and you should impress upon the SULTAN'S Ministers the importance of divesting the machinery of emancipation of any undue complexity or length.

Upon the question of the cost of compensation, and the ultimate charge in connection therewith that is likely to be imposed upon the Zanzibar Government, I do not feel that Her Majesty's Government are in the possession of sufficient data to enable them to arrive at a definite opinion. On the one hand, the initial expenses might be expected to be larger in the first year than at a later period. On the other hand, it seems to be anticipated that the attitude of the Friends' Mission in the Island of Pemba may,

by precipitating claims for freedom on the part of the Slaves, and consequently for compensation on the part of the masters, impose a heavier burden upon the Government in the near future. The experience of the forthcoming year will enable a more reliable judgment to be formed upon this point, and will place Her Majesty's Government in a better position for deciding whether any, and if so what, assistance shall be tendered by them to the Government of the SULTAN.

In conclusion, while I feel that it is as yet too early to pronounce upon the ultimate effect that the abolition of the legal status may have upon the cultivation of the clove plantations and upon the general prosperity of the islands, there seems to be good grounds for the hope that a measure, already attended with palpable benefit to the Slave, may in time produce a corresponding reinvigoration in the character and aptitudes of the master. He will at first be very susceptible of the difficulty of accommodating himself to the conditions of a situation both novel and financially exacting, and in some cases it is to be feared that cultivation may be affected, and that individuals, already impecunious or weighed down with burdens of debt, may suffer.

There will be inevitable cases of hardship at both ends of the scale, among masters, as there have previously been among Slaves, and any suggestions for the consideration of the interests of the former will be equally acceptable with those which have been invited for facilitating the redemption of the latter.

I am, etc.,

(Signed) SALISBURY.

The Foreign Office.

SIR MARTIN GOSSELIN, K.C.B.

With great pleasure we heard of the appointment of Sir M. GOSSELIN to the post of Assistant Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office (permanent). As we believe he will be in the African Section, we trust that his large experience will infuse a little more life into an office that has certainly languished since the abolition of the Slave-Trade Department. Sir MARTIN'S career has been long and varied. Nominated as an Attaché in 1868, and having passed through nearly all the capitals in Europe, he concluded an honourable career abroad by acting with great *éclat* as a British Commissioner at the Anglo-French Convention in Paris for the delimitation of Spheres of Influence on the Niger, 1897-98.

We had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of this gentleman at the Slave-trade Conference at Brussels in 1889-90, where he acted as one of the Secretaries under Lord VIVIAN, the British Delegate, and we feel sure from our former experience that he will take an intelligent interest in the anti-Slavery work which has still to be carried on in Africa and elsewhere.

FURTHER NOTEWORTHY DESPATCHES FROM
AFRICA No. 6.*Inclosure 1 in No. 25.*

SIR L. MATHEWS TO SIR A. HARDINGE.

ZANZIBAR, *February 3, 1898.*

SIR,—I have the honour to inclose herewith two reports by the Commissioners of this Government in Zanzibar and Pemba, on the working of the Decree abolishing the legal status of Slavery, from the 6th April, the date of its promulgation, to the present date.

The headings under which the Reports are drawn up were given to the Commissioners by me, and I would beg to call your attention to the similarity of the Reports under a number of these headings. This similarity is the more important, as the Reports come from the two men whom I consider, apart from their position as Commissioners of this Government, most fitted to give an opinion on the subject. They have both spent the best part of their lives in African Slave centres, and wherever Slavery has been rife. They are men of widely different tastes and training, and have had few, if any, opportunities of exchanging opinions on the subject of Slavery—the one being located in Pemba and the other here. My own opinion on the subject being entirely in accordance with theirs, it is not necessary for me to make any comment on their reports, but to confine myself to what has actually passed before me. It is also as well that Her Majesty's Government should learn from other sources than mine how the Decree is working and how the institution of Slavery is being gradually abolished.

With regard to the general working of the Decree I have the honour to state as follows :—

1. His Highness the Sultan of Zanzibar has in every possible way shown his loyalty to Her Majesty's Government, by putting into force in its fullest extent the Decree he made and promulgated at the instance of Her Majesty's Government. In almost all cases that have been brought to him personally he has subsequently sent them direct to my office, to be finally settled in accordance with the Decree.

In the one or two cases which he has dealt with himself he has acted most severely. For instance, one of his relations, a Princess, struck and intimidated a Slave girl, who, to escape from her mistress, jumped out of a window on to a lower roof, some 12 feet below ; the girl escaped and arrived at my office. The matter being one which affected one of his near relations, I saw him personally about it. He at once fined the Princess 500 rupees and freed the girl. In another case, in the early part of his reign, an Arab friend placed one of his Slaves in irons. On hearing of this and after inquiring into the matter, he ordered the Arab to be imprisoned, and placed in the same irons as he had put on his Slave.

Not only has he acted in this way, but from time to time when the Arabs have gone to him, he has informed them that his edict must and shall be kept in force, and for further information has referred them to me. No one could have acted more uprightly, and more in accordance with the views of the English Government, than he has done.

2. The Walis, Kathis, and native officials have been of great service in the administration of justice, and in the administration generally of the Island.

Heretofore the Island was more under the Sheikhs and overseers of the Sultans of Zanzibar working with Kathis and Arab soldiery under them. Now, and in connection with the abolition of the legal status of Slavery, properly appointed Governors with their staff of Kathis and regulars, are now each administering a separate district, as already reported by you in your despatches to Her Majesty's Government. Since the promulgation of the Decree, justice now is carried out for master and Slave alike, a Slave receiving the same consideration in the Courts of Law as his master, and verbal agreements are made between masters and their dependants as cases arise.

In one respect only the Walis have felt their duties too heavy for them, namely, the question of freedom, which entails adjusting compensation, and the whole matter of freedom and compensation has therefore been dealt with by me. This may appear to his Lordship a divergence from the original intention of Her Majesty's Government, but in practice, it comes to the same thing whether I settle all cases between Arabs and their Slaves and decide the compensation direct or through the Walis, as in any case, the matter of registration and payment of compensation must eventually come before me.

3. THE SLAVES.—We have found that all well cared for Slaves, such as domestic Slaves, Wastarabu (the more enlightened), and those born or brought up from early youth on plantations, prefer to remain with their masters rather than claim their freedom, and that the ordinary plantation Slaves who are allowed a fair division of land for themselves, also desire to remain under present agreements made with their masters, namely, three days every week clear for themselves, and at the time of harvesting cloves, an extra food allowance or money rations. Besides this, any extra work they may do they receive payment for.

As a rule the Slaves who will not live with their masters, and who claim their freedom, are prostitutes, vagrants, drunkards, and thieves. Whatever may be said by our friends at home of native immorality, even now the conduct of Mahomedan native women cannot be compared with the sights to be seen in the thoroughfares of some European cities. Whatever they may be they have sufficient modesty to keep their vices out of sight. It would be well if the Anti-Slavery faction turned their attention to what is going on in their midst, instead of interfering as they are now doing, with a people whose

religion punishes vices in the most severe manner, and with the English officials of the Government here, who are doing their best to carry out the directions of the home Government and the wishes of public opinion. The result of such hasty and ill-timed interference may bring about as bad a state of affairs here as in the centres of European civilisation. * * * In an Oriental country, where the administration of justice is under both Arab and European control, I am placed in a position where I am forced to act in accord with the spirit of Mahommedan law and common sense when in such cases I think it just to act summarily.

4. *The Arab Owners of Slaves.*

Naturally the Decree is felt as a direct blow to the holding of Slaves, but the justice of compensation for any loss they may sustain they perceive and thoroughly appreciate, and although it is also a direct blow against their religion and institutions, they feel that they are being dealt with fairly by a Great Power, which might at any moment, if it so pleased, emancipate their Slaves and ruin them, without requiring to give any reason for doing so. The old saying, "Mimi kuku wewe Kisu" ("I am the fowl and you the knife") they are continually quoting, but with all that there has been no general ill-feeling against Her Majesty's Government by the Slave owners.

Before closing this letter I would call your attention to the many letters written to the *Times* by the "Friends" and also a letter by Bishop TUCKER. You will see from Mr. FARLER'S report what he has said regarding the "Friends'" Mission at Pemba. It is a pity that Messrs. BURTT and ARMITAGE should be allowed to do as they pleased in the Island of Pemba. They being British subjects we are powerless to deal with them, and therefore they take every advantage of their position, and whatever is reported to them, true or false, they believe in without inquiry; in fact, as strangers, they are unable to get at the proper facts. The result is that the public at home are misinformed, and the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY causes Her Majesty's Government much unnecessary trouble.

The statement made by Bishop TUCKER in the *Times* is exactly the reverse of what happened. The true story is that a freed Slave, after imbibing a certain amount of strong tembo (fermented cocoa and tree juice), went round the plantations and called on all the Slaves not to do any work whatever for their masters, even although under an agreement, and became so aggressive that on some of the owners of the estates complaining, he was brought in and imprisoned. The sending out of police to the shambas was to arrest him, and had no connection with the people on the plantations—simply to arrest an aggressive drunkard.

Again, as regards the other statement that a Slave was seen being taken under police escort to be given up to his master. This is not true. From time to time I have to send police with Slaves who claim freedom to bring in their masters in order to settle whether compensation is to be paid or not. It is difficult in many cases from the Slave's description of his master to

identify the latter, so that I am forced to send many of them with police to bring in their masters. I therefore trust that you will bring these matters before Her Majesty's Government, in order that these misrepresentations may be corrected and apologies made in the *Times*, and that in future such reports from similar irresponsible persons may not be taken as correct without reference to yourself or to the Zanzibar Government.

I further call your attention to a photograph of a group of Slaves on inclosed tract issued by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. The one I refer to is on the last page, and is headed "A Group of Slaves under the British Flag in Zanzibar," and underneath, "Slavery in Zanzibar, 1896. Slaves in Chains Guarded by a native Askari or Soldier." This photograph was taken near Dar-es-Salam, which is on the mainland and the capital of German territory, not in Zanzibar. If they did not know it was taken in Dar-es-Salam, how can they tell whether the people in chains are Slaves or ordinary criminals? I may also point out that on the face of the picture itself, it could not represent a scene here, as the askari (soldier) wears German uniform, and carries a German rifle. No such rifle or uniform has ever been used by Zanzibar askari.

It is quite true as regards the photograph on the first page that some women were placed in irons. This was most unfortunate, the Chief Wali of Weti was ill, and for time being deputed his brother to act for him, who, in accordance with the old custom of placing vagrants in irons, acted without reference to his brother. Directly I heard of it I directed Mr. FARLER to inspect prisons and prisoners and overlook punishments and enforce the SULTAN'S Edict, which was promulgated in Zanzibar directly after his coming to the throne, that no women, whatever their crimes might be, should be imprisoned in irons. This is a single case, and has been made the most of in a most unfair manner by the "Friends" and ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

I have, etc.

(Signed) LLOYD WM. MATHEWS,

First Minister and Treasurer, Zanzibar Government.

Compare the above statement of General Sir L. MATHEWS, that only the riff-raff of the Slaves want to be free, with the following extract from a despatch from Dr. O'SULLIVAN, British Vice-Consul in Pemba, which states that those who want to be free are those who have been treated harshly and have found their lot "intolerable." So it is not in England only that "doctors" may be said to "disagree"!

"As regards the general working of the Decree of the 6th April, it is evident that, since the date of my report of the 30th September, 1897, the Slaves throughout Pemba have very generally grown to understand the purport of that measure, and they have availed themselves, in rapidly augmenting numbers, of its provisions upon their behalf. It is probable indeed, as Mr. BURTT states in his letter of the 21st October, 1897, that the Slaves are prejudiced against the Walis, and are diffident about applying directly

to them for their freedom ; but they find no difficulty in obtaining access, with that object, either to Archdeacon FARLER or to myself. In the case of those Slaves who make application to me in the first instance, I always refer them to the Wali, whose subsequent action I carefully note. In fairness to the Wali of Chaki-Chaki, I must state that up to the present he appears to me honestly to have endeavoured to carry out his instructions with respect to manumission. All applicants for freedom make their way to Chaki-Chaki, probably because that is the residence of the European officials. I have not heard lately of any Slaves applying to the Wali of Weti direct. In only two instances up to now, so far as I am aware, have *bonâ fide* concubines asked to be made free. Neither of the women in question preferred any charges of absolute ill-treatment against her master. One of them complained, chiefly, that she had no separate establishment, and that, generally speaking, she did not receive the amount of *heshima* to which she considered herself entitled. The other woman stated, as the reason of her discontent, that her master kept her too rigorously confined, and wished to be able to come and go as she pleased. In both of those instances, however, the parties arrived at a *modus vivendi*, and matters were arranged more or less satisfactorily.

"I can testify to the fact that no difficulties are now placed in the way of Slaves desirous of obtaining their liberty ; on the contrary, the road to freedom is made very easy for them. The proceeding generally adopted is this : when a Slave presents himself, and asks to be liberated, his name is duly registered, and he is sent to the Zanzibar Government *shamba*, at Tundaua, where he is fed at the Government expense, pending the settlement of his owner's claim for compensation.

"It is to be remarked that, in almost all instances hitherto, where Slaves have applied for their freedom, they have stated as their reason for so doing, and probably with truth, that their lot had become intolerable, owing to the harshness with which their owners treated them. Those among the servile population whose masters behave considerately towards them—and the masters, as a rule, have acquired sense enough by now to act more fairly towards their Slaves—have not, so far, displayed any particular eagerness to obtain their liberty. This apathy is not due to ignorance with regard to the purport of the recent Decree, for undoubtedly, as I have already stated, it has come to be known by this time by the Slaves generally throughout the island that they can obtain their freedom for the asking. Doubtless the explanation is to be found in the mental attitude peculiar to the servile population as a whole. The average Slave is not troubled with any feelings of sentiment concerning his social status, and is devoid of ambition. Sadly lacking in self-reliance, as indeed might be expected from a consideration of his antecedents, he shrinks instinctively from incurring those responsibilities which he realises would devolve upon him in the event of his becoming a free man, and hesitates to break away from the old ties and the old

conditions to which he has grown accustomed. To a like cause, probably, is to be attributed the behaviour of those applicants for manumission who, after having asked to be made free, and having duly been registered with that object, have changed their minds, and have voluntarily expressed a wish to return to their owners. There have been a considerable number of such instances, of which three have come under my notice within the past week."

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE ABOLITION OF LEGAL STATUS OF SLAVERY.

The following letters, taken from *Africa No. 6*, are important, as they show that when the Friends' Industrial Mission purchased their estate at Banani, in Pemba, the Slaves who had been working thereon for their former master wished to continue working for the Friends as free men. Mr. Vice-Consul CAVE, whilst admitting in reply to Mr. BURTT that these Slaves, having been purchased by their late owner since the Decree of 1890, were illegally held, were nevertheless obliged to apply to the Court for letters of freedom, and that under the Decree of 1897 they were "not *ipso facto* free, until such application had been made."

Herein we must beg to differ from Mr. CAVE. No such interpretation of the abolition of the legal status of Slavery has ever before been claimed in the history of abolition. As these men were held illegally, nobody could have possibly been entitled to compensation, and the Slaves, being admittedly free, should require no further process under the law.

No. 18.

MR. CAVE TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—(Received December 16.)
ZANZIBAR, *November 13th*, 1897.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a letter which I have received from the gentleman in charge of the Friends' Industrial Mission at Pemba, and of my reply thereto, with reference to certain natives residing on the estate recently purchased by that Mission near Chaki-Chaki, who are said to be the Slaves of the late owner of the property, but who, according to Mr. BURTT, do not wish to leave their present homes or to work for their master any longer.

I have been privately informed that some of the members of this Mission, more especially Mr. BURTT, are likely to cause some trouble by obstructing the working of the Anti-Slavery Decree in Pemba, and that they have already given great offence to the Arabs by encouraging the above-mentioned Slaves to remain on the Mission settlement, in disobedience to their master, without making any move towards obtaining their freedom in the proper way, but I trust that when they come to re-consider the matter they will see that, by so doing, they are not only giving rise to a regrettable and quite unnecessary feeling of soreness on the part of the Slave-owners, but are acting in direct opposition to the best interests of the Slaves themselves.

I have, etc., (*Signed*) BASIL S. CAVE.

MR. T. BURTT TO SIR A. HARDINGE.

FRIENDS' INDUSTRIAL MISSION, PEMBA,

ZANZIBAR, *October 21st, 1897.*

DEAR SIR,—On the shamba recently purchased by the above Mission there are a number of negroes who have resided there for some time, and are now in the regular employment of the Mission. These people are said to be the Slaves of the late owner of the shamba. They have expressed a strong wish to remain in their own homes, and continue to be employed on the shamba.

Will you be good enough to inform us if the late owner has any power to effect their removal from their homes against their wish, or whether any local authority possesses such power?

We should also be glad to know what means are necessary for these people to obtain their legal freedom, in accordance with the Decree of the 6th April, 1897? And whether we are correctly informed that it is necessary for these people to go to Zanzibar that their so-called owner may be compensated before they are granted their freedom; or whether they are, by virtue of the Decree, free now, and it rests with the so-called owner to apply for compensation if he wishes after the people are free; and for him to prove that he has by the application of the Decree been deprived of them, and that he was, before the passing of the Decree, legally entitled to hold them in Slavery?

The terror in the minds of many of these people, in having to appear before the Wali of Chaki-Chaki, and then being sent to Zanzibar, is such that, if this course is really necessary, the Decree of the 6th of April last becomes a dead letter.

Replies to the above questions, at an early date, will greatly oblige.

Yours, etc.,

(On behalf of the Friends' Industrial Mission),

(Signed) THEODORE BURTT.

P.S.—Many, if not all these people, state that their owner acquired them at the same time as he purchased the shamba, about two years ago. If this is so, are they not already free, inasmuch as they were acquired since the Treaty of 1890?

T. B.

MR. CAVE TO MR. T. BURTT.

ZANZIBAR, *November 9th, 1897.*

SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st ultimo, in which you inform me that there are a number of natives residing on the shamba, recently purchased by the Friends' Industrial Mission at Pemba, who are said to be the Slaves of the late proprietor of the estate, and who are anxious to obtain their freedom and to remain in their old homes. You inquire at the same time what steps it may be necessary to take in order that their object may be attained.

From the wording of Articles 1 and 2 of the Decree, published by His Highness the SULTAN on the 1st of Zilkada (6th April last), it is clear that neither the late owner of the shamba himself, not any local authority acting on his behalf, can effect the removal of these natives from their homes against their will. In Article 1 it is stated that "all claims of whatever description made . . . in respect of the alleged relations of master and Slave shall be referred to the District Court within whose jurisdiction they may arise," and in Article 2, "the District Court shall decline to enforce any alleged rights over the body, service, or property of any person on the ground that such person is a Slave."

The District Court, therefore, is the only authority to which any application can be addressed with regard to the alleged Slaves, either by the Slaves themselves or by the person who claims them, but that Court cannot enforce over the person of a Slave, because he is a Slave, any such alleged right as his compulsory removal from one place to another.

It follows from what I have already stated that, in order to obtain their freedom, such of the persons resident on your shamba as are Slaves must make an application to the District Court presided over by the Wali of Chaki-Chaki, who will take any further steps which may be necessary with regard to both the issue of the proper papers and the payment to the owner of whatever compensation may, on inquiry, be found to be due to him. The making of this application should, if the matter is properly represented to them, possess no terrors for the natives to whom you refer, for their interests will be in every way safeguarded, and there will be no necessity for them to be sent to Zanzibar. If, however, these people are still afraid of applying to the Wali on their own behalf, a request addressed to either Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Pemba or to the Commissioner of the Zanzibar Government will insure the cases being brought before the proper Court with as little delay as possible, and with little or no trouble to the applicants.

The object attained by the Decree of the 1st of Zilkada was not the total abolition of Slavery, but the abolition of its legal status. Slaves, therefore, though entitled to obtain their freedom by applying for it under the Decree, are not *ipso facto* free until such application has been made. This will equally hold good in the case of persons who, as suggested in the postscript to your letter under reply, have been acquired since the promulgation of the Decree of 1890, and are therefore illegally held, but in the latter case the master can have no possible claim to compensation.

You will, I think, agree with me that it is to the interest of the people in whose behalf you write to have their freedom duly effected and registered by the Court which has been appointed for that purpose, and I would appeal to you, both on their account and in order that no unnecessary friction may be caused between the Government of Zanzibar and His Highness's subjects, to use your influence whenever it is possible to persuade natives to apply for their freedom, should they wish to do so, in the manner prescribed by the Decree, and so lend your assistance to the proper fulfilment of the object for which that Decree was framed.—I am, etc., (Signed) BASIL S. CAVE.

Slave Children Born after 1889.

LORD SALISBURY DISAGREES WITH SIR ARTHUR HARDINGE.

No. 22.

SIR A. HARDINGE TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY (*Received March 11.*)

MOMBASA,

February 9, 1898.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to inclose herewith a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Sub-Commissioner for this province, reporting a decision lately given by him as Judge of the Native Provincial Court, sitting with the CADI OF MOMBASA and another Moslem doctor as assessors, with respect to the division of Slaves between the children of their deceased owners.

Your Lordship will observe that the Native Provincial Court in this judgment indirectly ignores the Decree of SEYYID KHALIFA, under which all Slaves born after 1889 are declared *ipso facto* free. I understand that the ground on which it did so is the legal maxim that law only becomes law, or at least only becomes binding and operative by promulgation, and that as SEYYID KHALIFA never made this Decree public, but merely promised Sir GERALD PORTAL that he would publish it at some future more convenient season, stipulating that his consent to it should, in the meantime, be kept a secret from his subjects, it cannot be regarded as having ever been promulgated, and lacks therefore any legal validity. It has indeed, out of regard for the interest of Slave children of tender years, who, had its existence been known to their masters, would have been free and left without support, never been applied at Zanzibar itself even by those who, like myself when I first came there, were under the mistaken impression that it had been published, whilst as far as the mainland is concerned not only could no copy of it or legal evidence of its existence be produced, but it appears never to have been communicated to the Imperial British East Africa Company who were at that time administering the country, or brought directly or indirectly to the knowledge of its inhabitants. Both the District and the Provincial Courts considered themselves therefore obliged, in the presence of numerous legal precedents to the same effect, to ignore it, and there can be little doubt that both the Chief Native Court, and the Native High Court of Appeal at Zanzibar, would, on grounds of pure law, as distinct from considerations of political expediency or sentiment, confirm the decision of these Tribunals. It is not improbable that that decision may be appealed against, as Bishop TUCKER is watching with great vigilance every sentence affecting directly or indirectly the legal status of Slavery in this country, but as it has been given judicially, I do not feel that, as an executive officer, I can in any way interfere with its effects, unless and until it should be revised by a higher Court.

I believe that in Zanzibar compensation has been granted by the Courts in respect of children born since 1889, on the ground that these children have been fed and maintained at an age when they could not work, by their masters, who would not have so maintained them had the Decree of SEYYID KHALIFA been made public, and the children been in consequence freed.

I have, etc.,

(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

No. 27.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY TO SIR A. HARDINGE.

FOREIGN OFFICE,

May 9th, 1898.

SIR,—I received in due course your despatch of the 9th of February, reporting a decision recently given by Her Majesty's Sub-Commissioner for the Seyyidieh Province, sitting as Judge of the Native Provincial Court with the CADI OF MOMBASA and another Moslem doctor as assessors, with respect to the division of Slaves among the children of their deceased owners.

The case, as it appears from the Sub-Commissioner's report, was one which affected the status of two children of a Slave mother, both under seven years of age, and the ruling was that these children, as being Slaves, were liable to be disposed of according to the Mahommedan law for the division of Slaves.

In your comments on this ruling you point out quite correctly that it indirectly ignores the engagement made to Her Majesty's Government by SEYYID KHALIFA in 1889, under which all Slaves born after 1889 are declared free, and you then proceed to argue that as that Agreement was never formally promulgated as a Decree it lacks any legal validity, and consequently that the District and Provincial Courts were legally obliged to ignore it.

Her Majesty's Government are unable to accept this view.

They hold that it is impossible at this date to go back upon the Agreement of 1889. It has been widely circulated in this country, has never been questioned by the Government of the Sultan, has always been regarded and frequently quoted as valid by Her Majesty's Government, and was specially included in a historical summary of the steps taken by successive British Governments in the direction of emancipation, which was prefixed to the instructions given to you on the 10th February, 1897, respecting the abolition of the legal status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, which have been laid before Parliament.

To abrogate this particular provision now on the plea of technical validity, is not a course in which Her Majesty's Government can acquiesce,

and even if the decision of the Mombasa Court were to be sustained upon appeal to Zanzibar, the Protecting Power could not accept a decision in such violent conflict with its own policy and pledges.

If children born since 1890 are legally held in Mombasa they are equally legally held in Zanzibar, and if the Compensation Courts in the latter island have given compensation for children so held in Zanzibar, they have, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, adopted a course which is illegal, and which cannot be permitted to continue.

Whilst the views of Her Majesty's Government on this subject are as above expressed, they gather from your despatch that there is some danger that if they were too abruptly pressed upon the Arab Slave-holders, the latter might repudiate all responsibility for the children affected, who would then be left in destitution and exposed to danger of starvation.

You should report as to the steps by which this danger can best be averted.

In conclusion, I have to impress upon you that Her Majesty's Government continue to regard, as they have always hitherto done, the various Decrees and Agreements relating to Slavery as progressive steps in the direction of its ultimate abolition, and that any measure inconsistent with this policy such as is here suggested would, in their opinion, be productive of evil rather than of good.

I am, etc.,
(Signed) SALISBURY.

What the Press Says.

From the "TIMES," July 25th.

THE Parliamentary paper which has just been issued on the operation of the recent anti-Slavery legislation in Zanzibar and Pemba is in many respects of unusual interest. It affords a vivid and authentic picture of the first effects of a profound economic and social reform imposed upon the Government and the people of a protected State by the will of the British Parliament. Sufficient time has not yet perhaps gone by to enable us to affirm with certainty what will be the permanent results of the transformation now in progress. But while the future is by no means free from doubts and anxieties, the official reports drawn up by those whose duty it is to watch and to direct the application of the new law afford solid grounds for hoping that the beneficent purposes of its authors will gradually be fulfilled without ruin to the Slave-owners of the islands. The decree of the SULTAN which abolished the legal status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba was issued on April 6, 1897. It was not extended to the dominions of His Highness upon the mainland for the reasons stated by Lord SALISBURY in the despatch of June 29, terminating

the correspondence, a summary of which we published on Saturday. The change is less urgently required upon the mainland, and, at the same time, it would be more difficult of execution. In fact, there seems reason to believe that any premature attempt to extend the reform beyond the islands might be followed by very serious consequences. A comprehensive report by Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE gives a consecutive account of the actual results of the decree down to the end of April of the present year, while valuable information—not unmingled with humorous details—is contained in much of the previous correspondence. Our knowledge of events in Pemba—the more backward island of the two—is brought down to June by a report from Mr. EDIB, the acting Vice-Consul at Chaki-Chaki.

Up to the end of April—that is, roughly, within the first year that the promulgation of the decree—4,278 Slaves had obtained their freedom. Rather more than half of these, it is interesting to observe, had not been freed by the Courts, but by entering into contracts as free labourers with their former masters. It is significant that in Zanzibar the proportion of such contracts is enormously higher than in Pemba. The compensation paid to the masters has been less than £1,100 out of a total expenditure under the decree of £9,000. The numbers enfranchised may seem small relatively to the total Slave population, but there is reason to believe that the rate may become accelerated in the near future. Indeed, the last report from Pemba speaks of the applicants for manumission as blocking the approaches to the Court. So far the indirect effects of the decree have been greater, and of greater value than its direct consequences. Both masters and Slaves know it may be invoked, and they regulate their action towards each other in accordance with this knowledge. Masters are anxious to retain their Slaves by good treatment and liberal agreements. Slaves are ready to bring complaints of ill-usage before the Courts. They are less willing to keep the terms of the bargains they make with their late owner, and evince in some instances a strong desire to squat upon his land and steal his cocoanuts without performing the labour they have agreed to give as rent. Where cash wages are paid they are prepared to work, but as they can help themselves to the produce they object to working for it. Of the urban Slaves those who belong to the wealthy and to the very poor owners do not avail themselves of their new rights. The Slaves of a wealthy household are proud of their position. They are well fed and well clad, and they know that in sickness and old age they will be cared for by their masters. A curious illustration of their feelings and their reasoning will be found in the statement made to Mrs. ALEXANDER, whose husband issues letters of emancipation on behalf of Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, by a servant in her employment who is also a Slave of TIPPOO TIB. The Slaves of the very poor are, for all practical purposes, the equals of their masters. They eat out of their dish, and are rather partners than subordinates. It is the Slaves of the middle-class who have made use most largely of the Decree. On the whole Sir

ARTHUR HARDINGE declares that the situation of Slaves since the reform of April, 1897, is one which "the proletariat of most European States would regard with envy." So far the dreaded dislocation of the labour market has not been produced, and the rate of wages even remains unchanged.

It is much to be regretted that the disposition and the attitude of the officials, both British and native, have been subject to a good deal of misrepresentation at the hands of the less judicious advocates of emancipation. Mr. THEODORE BURTT, a missionary sent to Pemba by the Society of Friends, brought a series of very grave charges against one of the Walis in that island. The Wali demanded to be confronted with his accuser, and Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE requested Mr. BURTT to attend the court and to bring with him his native interpreter for examination. Mr. BURTT thought fit to refuse to accede to either request. Sir ARTHUR was obliged to conduct the inquiry in the absence of the accuser and of the material witness under his control. It resulted in the exculpation of the Wali on evidence of an entirely satisfactory kind. The zeal which led the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY to republish and circulate as a photograph of "a group of Slaves under the British flag in Zanzibar" what was in fact a group of Slaves or criminals under the German flag at Dar-es-Salaam, and the very inadequate explanation of the step offered by Mr. ALLEN, their secretary, are further examples of the difficulties created for the responsible British officials by their own countrymen. It is to be hoped that the lesson they have received will teach these gentlemen not to be so ready to believe and publish evil of English rule and English rulers in the future.

A COMMENT ON THE ABOVE:—

To the Editor of the "TIMES."

SIR,—I have just read with much interest your article and review on the Parliamentary Papers lately issued on Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. I observe one point to which you draw special attention—that is, a photo of a group of Slaves, really taken in Dar-es-Salaam, which Mr. C. H. ALLEN issued under a mistaken idea that they had been photographed in Zanzibar. That gentleman has fully explained in your columns the reason which induced him to issue it, and its subsequent withdrawal. I hope you will kindly permit me to point out in further explanation that the photo in question fairly represents what was taking place in 1895. During my visit in that year I have frequently passed gangs of women Slaves in the streets of Zanzibar, chained together and followed by an askari. It was an everyday event. I have seen the same thing in Dar-es-Salaam, the only difference being that those under British rule were better fed. It will therefore be seen that there were gangs of chained Slaves under the British flag as well as under the German. While I disclaim having any part in the issue of the

photo to which attention has been called, I cannot help stating that although the photo was taken in Dar-es-Salaam, it was a fair representation of what was taking place in Zanzibar.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

DONALD MACKENZIE.

THE HOWDLIES, BURSTOW, SURREY,
July 27.

From the "GLASGOW EVENING TIMES," July 27th.

IN the official correspondence on Slavery in Zanzibar, which was published this week, complaint is made to Lord SALISBURY, by Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, our Agent at Zanzibar, of the action of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, in circulating a leaflet containing a picture of Slaves in chains. Above the picture, which was taken from a photograph, were the words, "A Group of Slaves under the British Flag at Zanzibar"; and below there was an appropriate verse of Scripture about oppression. After eighteen months' investigation, the authorities at Zanzibar found that the photograph was not taken there at all, but in German East Africa. The ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY has, in consequence, been subjected to a good deal of criticism; but the explanation of the Secretary of that body is quite satisfactory. The picture appeared originally in the *Illustrated London News*, in September, 1896, when an article, with several illustrations, was published in that weekly, on the then crisis in Zanzibar. In perfect good faith, the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY purchased the "block," and used it to add to the effectiveness of one of its publications. The mistake is no doubt unfortunate; but if anyone is to blame it is the photographer at Zanzibar, who sold the original picture to the correspondent of the *Illustrated London News*. As an incident like this may do much damage to a really good cause, those engaged in the Anti-Slavery movement cannot be too careful to verify everything in connection with their publications.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.

From the "DAILY NEWS," July 25th.

PAPERS have just been laid before Parliament which give the official view of the results that followed the abolition of Slavery as a "legal status" in Zanzibar and Pemba rather more than a year ago. The most important documents in the collection are a dispatch from the Consul-General, dated the 23rd of April, and the Foreign Secretary's reply, dated the 29th of June. As Lord SALISBURY is still Prime Minister, and Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE is after all only Consul-General of Zanzibar, we make no apology for beginning with the less dogmatic, if more authoritative of these two pronouncements. Lord SALISBURY, we need hardly say, is far enough from the taint of humanitarian enthusiasm to satisfy the most cynical reader. But as

a Christian gentleman he cannot altogether conceal his distaste for legalised servitude, and he has not imbibed Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE's smart modern sympathy with the "peculiar institution." Lord SALISBURY dwells once more, as he dwelt in 1897, upon the difficulty of interfering with the sanctions of the Mohammedan religion in what is not British territory but a protected State. He cites the example of India, where, in States nominally independent, though under British protection, the Slave-trade only was abolished, and Slavery remained. These difficulties and distinctions were contemptuously brushed aside by the Tory party in general, and by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in particular, during the tenure of the late Liberal Administration. Problems always seem easy so long as other people have to solve them. But on this question there is only one safe rule for British authorities. It is the path of safety because it is the path of honour. It is an absolute and unalterable refusal to recognise the lawfulness of Slavery for any purpose or in any shape. Lord SALISBURY claims credit for having improved upon the Indian model by abolishing Slavery altogether in the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar. But he has to admit that a similar course has not been followed on the mainland, where the conditions of forced labour "call less urgently for relief." We trust that the subject will be raised in the House of Commons before Parliament is prorogued, and that the Liberal party, at all events, will denounce the tolerance of Slavery by the Government of the Queen. Lord SALISBURY reaffirms his position, and declines to make any advance upon it. But he is afraid to speak out. "At the same time," he writes, "an acquiescence, however reasonable or widespread, in the *status quo* would not justify any diminution in the effort to supersede over as large an area as possible the conditions of servile labour by those of free labour for a wage." We should hope not, indeed. But this halting and apologetical language is not fit for the mouth or the pen of a British Minister. Self-government is not always possible in backward or in Oriental communities. Personal liberty is possible everywhere, and is a primary test of civilised rule.

"Her Majesty's Government are not disposed to share the disappointment that has been expressed in some quarters as to the relatively slow rate of progress that is said to have been made. A readjustment rather than a violent revolution in the social economy of the Islands has always been their object." So says Lord SALISBURY. The obvious comment is, that if that be so, Her Majesty's Government are not entitled to speak for the people of the United Kingdom, who expect that under British jurisdiction or British protection Slavery shall cease and determine. Even the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR himself, to whose loyal co-operation Lord SALISBURY pays a high tribute, might probably of his own accord take measures for the gradual benefit of the Slave. Professor MOMMSEN asserts in his History that all the horrors of African Slavery are a drop in the ocean when compared with the sufferings of Roman Slaves. Whether that startling statement be approximately true or not, there can be no doubt that even Slavery becomes less harsh with the

growth of humanity and the lapse of time. But that fact does not remove or even diminish, the obligations of this country to put Slavery down wherever the QUEEN is the paramount Power. Lord SALISBURY feels very much for the hardships of masters deprived of their Slaves. So did the sympathetic child, contemplating the famous picture of Roman persecution, lift up her voice and weep for the poor lion which had got no martyr. But one need not be a Quaker or a philanthropist to feel that there are objects better deserving of an English Premier's condolence than a Slaveowner bereft of his human property. Lord SALISBURY seems to have fallen under the influence of the astute and accomplished gentleman who represents the Foreign Office at Zanzibar. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE is frank and courageous. He does not disguise his belief that Slavery, if not morality, is geographical. Sir GEORGE TREVELYAN said of the Tories 30 years ago that they "like the British working man, but like him in his proper place." Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE likes the working population of Zanzibar so much that he likes to see them made to work. He has had to promulgate the abolition of Slavery in the Islands, and he has carried out his orders. But he does not pretend to approve of them, and he enumerates with caustic severity the numerous drawbacks he has observed. He shares the unreasonable temper which Carlyle and others displayed half a century ago. He expects a newly-emancipated Slave to exhibit at once all the virtues of freedom. No one who has read Dickens's "Tale of Two Cities" can have forgotten the prisoner so long confined in the Bastille that when he was released his faculties were paralysed by the light of day. It would have been illogical as well as inhuman to argue that he had never been fit for liberty.

It is satisfactory to learn that "2,000 Slaves have obtained their freedom in consequence of the news, and 2,278 more have, without claiming papers of freedom, made contracts with their masters as free labourers." But with this definite piece of information, and the statistical abstract he appends to it, Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE's congratulatory impulses exhaust themselves once for all. He proceeds to remark that no concubines have yet applied for freedom. "Their complaints are either preference shown by the master for some other girl or the withholding of some promised piece of finery." Whether this is the sort of thing which amuses Lord SALISBURY we do not know. It is not quite the style, or perhaps we should rather say quite the form, which the serious portion of the public expect in official dispatches from the representatives of the QUEEN. Sir ARTHUR is happier and more humorous in disposing of the objection that the decree for abolishing Slavery was published in Arabic, and not in Swahili. He observes that as the population was entirely illiterate, the nature of the language made no difference to them. We believe that the same argument was used in favour of drawing indictments in Latin at the Assizes, before the schoolmaster was abroad. But it is only fair to accept Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE's assurance that Sir LLOYD MATHEWS and the other Ministers of the Sultan did not attempt

to suppress the decree. "The Slaves will work willingly for pice, but never for produce, which they have the trouble of having to take to the towns to sell before they can turn it into money, and which they find it simpler to steal it straight off." That is another example of Sir ARTHUR'S second best manner. It is smart, and raises a smile; but it is not very generous, and not very decorous. If a Slave is dishonest, that is no fault of his. The virtues of men are not to be expected from a population depressed below the level of manhood. That Slavery destroys half a man's character is a truth as old as HOMER, who had not the educational advantages of Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE. Sir ARTHUR refers to lazy Slaves who protested against their discharge, and obstinate Slaves who resisted eviction from their holdings. Free men have resisted eviction, and we fail to understand why the legal abolition of Slavery should involve the compulsory dismissal of a servant. The Consul-General displays the resources of his eloquence in depicting the happiness of Zanzibar Slaves. He may perhaps have heard of the English traveller who cross-examined a fugitive from the Southern States during the American War. Was his master cruel to him? Had he been beaten, starved, or otherwise ill-used? No, he had not. Then why had he run away? "Well," said the man of colour, "I guess you'll find the place still vacant, if you care to apply."

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.

From the "SHEFFIELD INDEPENDENT," July 26th.

THE work of emancipating the Slaves in Zanzibar is proceeding slowly—too slowly, indeed. It has gone far enough, however, to indicate what its effects are likely to be; and up to the present there is no trace of that general rioting and dislocation of trade which it was feared in some quarters would follow emancipation. The method which is being pursued in Zanzibar and Pemba—although not in the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR'S mainland territories—is the abolition of the legal status of Slavery, the granting of freedom to Slaves who choose to claim it, and the paying of compensation to masters who have thus lost their Slaves. A great many Slaves have already sought their liberty, although many have not yet taken the opportunity of doing so. It must not be supposed from this that the lot of the Slaves is a desirable one. Not all masters are cruel by any means, and some Slaves are fairly comfortable; but it is significant that those who have claimed freedom belong for the most part to the better class—they have not sunk into such a state of degradation and ignorance as to be content with their state of life. Some 4,000 Slaves are already free, or half free—that is, have made contracts with their masters as free labourers without taking out letters of emancipation. But there is still a very great number who remain in Slavery; and it must be confessed that until these also are liberated Englishmen will not feel comfortable over the matter. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE is too able a man and too conscientious an administrator to neglect the duties

imposed upon him by the British Government; but at the same time he does not view Slavery as it exists in Zanzibar with the disfavour that we could wish. He has communicated his scruples to Lord SALISBURY, and that statesman, as usual, is overcome with the difficulties of the situation. Saying that a situation is difficult is in Lord SALISBURY'S eyes the same thing as saying that there is no way out of it, or at best only a bad way. In the Prime Minister's despatch to Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE on the subject, he is only too ready to approve of and find fresh reasons for a delay which, to Englishmen led to believe that Slavery cannot exist under the British flag, is to say the least of it singular. It may be argued, of course, that Zanzibar is not strictly under the British flag. It is a "protected State"; but that does not imply that there is any option on the part of the native ruler in carrying out the commands of her Britannic Majesty. That Slavery should exist where British influence is predominant is a state of things which demands a remedy as prompt as possible. The debasement of men and women implied by the condition of Slavery is entirely abhorrent to British ideas—it appeals to our keenest sense of right and wrong. It is freely granted that there are difficulties in the way of removing the taint from Zanzibar; but they are not difficulties to be shrunk from, and our Foreign Office, after much cogitation, has only found a means of shrinking from them. Liberation in Zanzibar and Pemba is proceeding in lukewarm fashion, and on the mainland it is not proceeding at all. We do not want mischief as a result of precipitate measures; but we do expect to see those who are called upon to do this work doing it with discretion, but with whole-heartedness. But it is useless to expect whole-heartedness from Lord SALISBURY.

SLAVERY UNDER THE BRITISH FLAG.

From the "CHRISTIAN GLOBE," July 28th.

THE great justification for the rapid and prodigious extension of the British Empire is that, wherever our flag goes, barbarism gives place to civilisation, anarchy to good government. The blessings of Christianity, freedom, and peace, which we have long enjoyed, we endeavour to bestow upon the inhabitants of all parts of the world where our influence is predominant. It is on that understanding that the people of this country consent to the increased burdens and responsibilities which the extension of the Empire necessitates. If there is one thing upon which all English people are united it is in their abhorrence of Slavery, and in their determination that it shall not exist where the English flag flies. In spite of that our rulers tolerated the existence of Slavery in Zanzibar because of the difficulties of suppressing it. A little more than a year ago, however, public opinion compelled the authorities to abolish the status of Slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. On the mainland, however, this has not been done. We fully

realise the difficulties which exist. The horrible and degrading institution of Slavery has been in existence for so long that to root it out entirely would require very energetic measures indeed. But we contend that our officials are too much inclined to tolerate the evil. They declare that the natives are not fit for freedom, and when they get it do not know how to use it. That is the stock argument of those who favour the continuance of an iniquitous system. The obvious reply is that these poor creatures must be taught how to live and prosper as free men. We want no Slaves in the Empire. It is gratifying to know that something has been done. Over two thousand Slaves have obtained their freedom in consequence of our action, and a like number have, without claiming papers of freedom, made contracts with their masters as free labourers. The work must be pressed on and the agitation must be maintained. British officials must be instructed that on no consideration must the institution of Slavery be tolerated. Otherwise the evil will grow, and the British flag will gradually cease to be considered the guarantee of freedom and justice which it now is to millions of human beings of all creeds and colours. No matter what Government is in power, our leaders are always inclined for the sake of peace to let sleeping dogs lie. It is essential, therefore, that all who have at heart the interests of humanity and the honour of our race should keep alive the agitation against Slavery in any shape or form.

THAT FOUL STAIN ON THE BRITISH FLAG.

From the "FREEMAN," July 29th.

ARE the Baptists of Great Britain as strong in their abhorrence of Slavery as their fathers were? We fear not, or they would not sit down so calmly whilst the atrocity exists in Zanzibar, under the British flag. As we read, from time to time, of the degradation and suffering in the islands on the East Coast of Africa, under a British Protectorate, we feel ashamed with a great shame at the supineness of our Government. For complicity with Slavery is a crime, and that crime lies at the door of our rulers. And there we fear it will lie, until the people speak out. If the matter touched our commerce, an agitation would arise, and sufficient force to conquer the evil be sent out; but, as it affects our righteousness, there is carelessness, for the nation is not yet aroused to a sense of its truest interest. Still, the grand name of Liberty ought not to have lost its charm. In the House of Commons, last February, Mr. GEORGE CURZON, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, bade us remember that the abolition of the legal status of Slavery is not the same thing as the abolition of Slavery itself. If Slavery itself is abolished, every Slave becomes *ipso facto* free from that moment; he is free to run away from his master or his service, and to do what he pleases. If there is anything in the distinction, then it is a burning shame.

Are the people to be fooled by clever sentences? We hate cant. If Slavery is not abolished under the British flag, then we ought to know the reason why. It appears that it is nominally, but with the monstrous provision that the British Government, having assented to the Decree in a certain form, is precluded for all time from making any change in the status of the Slaves, except on payment of full compensation to their masters! Thus was introduced, as the direct result of the provision for compensation, the elaborate procedure under which every individual Slave has to prove his right to that freedom which the proclamation of the SULTAN professes to have already conferred on them all. The natural consequence is that emancipation proceeds at so ridiculously slow a pace that the solitary official employed in the work on Pemba has only succeeded in emancipating about 2,000!!* No wonder that we and our professions are the ridicule of the brutal Slave-holder, and the British flag the object of his scorn.

Still something has been done, and the mantle of WILLIAM KNIBB is on the shoulders of the Rev. ALFRED R. TUCKER, Bishop of East Equatorial Africa.

[The writer then gives the details of Bishop TUCKER's recently decided Slave case, already fully reported in our columns, and the article closes as follows :—]

All praise to Bishop TUCKER. This decision gives a new aspect to the case. It really means that nine-tenths of the Slaves on the mainland are illegally held in bondage, and even if the principle of compensation be conceded the owners would have no claim whatsoever. But what a shameful state of things this reveals! How can we expect Slaves to fight out a legal case, point after point, like this. Further, it appears that still this applies only to about nine-tenths. How about the other tenth? What we demand is this, that our Queen should, by a stroke of the pen, free every Slave under her flag, without a care for the consequences. We do not ask for any abolition of the legal status of Slavery, or any misguiding form of words. Nor for any legal process whatever. Let every man, woman, and child be free. And if ruin follows, let it light on those who have been filling their bags with the wages of iniquity. We have no desire that such a brute as the defendant in this case, who could drive a girl into prostitution and take her wages and then beat her barbarously, should go free from the consequences. There should, we admit, be compensation, but it is the freed Slaves who ought to receive it, and their brutal masters either be forced to pay it or clear out and try for an honest livelihood. Then something might be done to help the freed Slaves generally—a sadly degraded and helpless class—to live a life of freedom.

* This number is much too high; the total number of Pemba Slaves who had received, or were about to receive, freedom papers, or who had contracted to work as free labourers, was estimated by Sir A. HARDINGE, in April last, at 1,033.—ED., *Reporter*.

From the "LEEDS MERCURY," July 26th.

MORE than fifteen months have passed since the legal status of Slavery was formally abolished in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar. From a Parliamentary paper, which has just been issued, it is now possible to obtain some idea of the working of the Decree of emancipation. The simplest way in order to arrive at the results achieved is to take the actual number of Slaves liberated and compare it with the total number in bondage when the Decree was promulgated. In a despatch to Lord SALISBURY at the end of April last, Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, our representative at Zanzibar, states that during the previous twelve months 2,000 Slaves were set free by the Courts; whilst 2,278 virtually obtained their liberty since they contracted as free labourers with their old masters, without, however, applying to the Courts for their manumission. Now, it has been estimated that two-thirds of the entire population of Zanzibar and Pemba, which is about 210,000, is in a state of Slavery. Therefore, only 4,278 out of 140,000 Slaves have been liberated as a result of the Decree of emancipation during the first twelve months. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE tells Lord SALISBURY that the methods adopted to secure the abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar constitute "a conservative and cautious reform of far-reaching ultimate consequences rather than of striking immediate effects, and as such . . . is in substantial harmony with the genius of the best and wisest English legislation." If, within a year after issuing what professes to be a proclamation of liberty to the captive, only 2,000 out of 140,000 Slaves have legally secured their freedom, it is a matter of easy arithmetic to show that at this rate seventy years must elapse before the bonds of all the captives in the Protectorate are loosed. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE's claim that the measures for the abolition of Slavery which he has helped to frame and carry out are "conservative and cautious" and productive of no "striking immediate effects" may thus be freely admitted; but there will likely be some demur to his contention that a scheme which will eventually liberate all the Slaves of Zanzibar and Pemba by the year 1968 A.D. is "in substantial harmony with the genius of the best and wisest English legislation." Clearly the British Agent at Zanzibar entertains very peculiar notions of what constitutes the strength and the wisdom of English legislation if he imagines that these qualities are conspicuous in the Decree promulgated in April of last year, and in the means employed to give effect to its provisions. More than once the unsatisfactory nature of the terms of the proclamation "abolishing" Slavery in Zanzibar have been commented upon in these columns. Both the Government and its representative at Zanzibar seem to have taken only a half-hearted interest in a cause which must appeal to all humanitarians and to every person of strong moral feeling. The slow and cumbersome legal procedure adopted, the system of compensating the owners of manumitted Slaves, the denial of liberty to women Slaves who are kept as concubines, and the exclusion of the mainland dominions of the SULTAN from the scope of the proclamation, are some of the

more objectionable features of the abolition scheme sanctioned by the Government. Many of the difficulties that have been encountered in freeing the Slaves must be ascribed to the unfortunate proclamation issued by Lord SALISBURY about eight years ago when the Protectorate of Zanzibar was acquired. In that document the Slave-owners' rights of property in their human chattels were guaranteed "under the authority and sanction of the British Government." After this deplorable acknowledgment compensation was inevitable. Bishop TUCKER, of Uganda, the Friends' Mission at Pemba, and the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY have done a much-needed work in rousing the conscience of this country to a sense of its responsibility for the evils of the Slavery system at Zanzibar—evils which the Government has done its best to minimise, and comparatively little to remove. This indifference is, perhaps, not surprising, for if we are to believe Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, the lot of a Zanzibari Slave is ideally happy. There are said, however, to be two sides to every story, and it, therefore, would be interesting to hear what the Slave has to say on the subject.

From the "DAILY CHRONICLE," July 29th.

The question of the enforcement of Slavery by British Courts in the territories of Zanzibar created plenty of excitement last February, when Mr. CURZON and the Government appeared to be anxious to maintain the theory that Slavery under the British flag was not so incongruous as most of us have supposed. By the exertions of Bishop TUCKER the tangled state of things which was created by the action of the Government in Zanzibar has been brought, after long delays, to a judicial decision, the documents in which have been made public by the ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. The result is very curious. A female Slave, who had taken refuge from the alleged cruelty of a sheikh of Mombasa, has been in the end declared free, instead of being given up to the claimant; but Mr. CRAUFURD, the judge of the Provincial Court, appears to have negatived most of the pleas on which the emancipating Bishop relied.

He entirely refused to give any weight to the proposition that a British Court cannot enforce a Slave claim. He holds, in fact, that Slavery is in full force in Mombasa, and that, subject to certain statutory limitations, he will enforce a master's claim to rights of property in the person of his Slaves. The only plea which he admits is that a Decree issued in 1876, on the advice of Sir JOHN KIRK, has made it ever since that date unlawful to bring down from the interior to the Zanzibar coast any "raw Slaves." The result is that it is decided, apparently for the first time, that all Slaves obtained by owners in Mombasa after 1876 are illegally held, and can claim their freedom if they choose. This, of course, is so far satisfactory, but we should like to hear the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on Mr. CRAUFURD's declaration that, if a Slave was brought down from the interior prior to the

Decree in question, the master of that Slave can now apply to a British Court to have the Slave restored to him. If this is a true interpretation of the local law, then the local law must be changed.

Now we have the sequel. A Foreign Office paper, just issued as "Africa No. 6," gives us not only the despatches of Sir A. HARDINGE and his subordinates as to the condition of the islands and the mainland, and in particular as to the very violent conflict with the "Friends' Mission," in which they evidently live, but it also gives us Lord SALISBURY's last word, in a despatch dated June 29. He says, in effect, that there is to be no change. Slavery is abolished on the islands, subject to two things—proceedings taken by the Slave, which the officials are not too anxious to encourage, and compensation to the master, which Lord SALISBURY is not eager to pay. The rate of emancipation even here is admittedly slow, and one of the offences of the "Friends" is that they are hurrying it. In Mombasa and on the mainland generally, Lord SALISBURY makes excuse for leaving Slavery, in plain terms, unabolished. To our mind, his excuse amounts to nothing. But whether it be right or wrong, the result is clear. Slavery will continue, until further order, to be enforced by British judges. If public opinion here were not very dead, the further order would come soon.

From the "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN," July 25th.

THE newly published correspondence on the "abolition of the legal status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba" is in many respects a remarkable document. Those who learnt in their childhood that one of the glories of the British nation and of the age of progress in which we live is that under the British flag the Slave at once becomes a free man may rise from its perusal with a chastened conception of national glory. They will find in its pages how one or two obstinate men, bred in the same tradition, have gone doggedly to work helping Slaves to emancipate themselves, and how they have thereby incurred the hostility of the whole official world, which has the columns of the Parliamentary paper placed at its disposal for replying to their charges and making counter-accusations. They will also find British officials contesting the acts of emancipation point by point, clinging to their right to send back fugitive Slaves to their masters, endeavouring to treat Decrees of emancipation as null, upholding Slave-concubinage, and stigmatising the supporters of British law in East Africa as the "Anti-Slavery Faction." In the attack on Mr. BURTT, of the Friends' Mission in Pemba, Lord SALISBURY expressly joins. He hopes that "the complete refutation" of his statements will have its effect in this country. Of this we shall be in a better position to judge when we have heard Mr. BURTT's reply to this correspondence, a great deal of which is in fact no more than a series of accusations and reproaches levelled against missionaries generally and the Friends' Mission in particular. The character of the Correspondence is not judicial enough for us to take it as anything more than a statement of the case against the missions. It is of course possible that Mr. BURTT may have been misinformed in certain instances by native interpreters, but it is worthy of remark that in one of the cases of injustice which he alleged against the native magistrate, or Wali, even Sir A. HARDINGE admits that that official had been careless, and had committed an act of injustice, though, he believes, unwittingly. But

the main accusation against the Friends' Mission is that they harbour runaway Slaves at their station and make it a great deal too pleasant for them, the consequence being that other Slaves leave their masters and join them, and emancipation goes on a great deal too fast to please the official mind. In fact, the authorities would evidently like to treat them as the Indian Government treats suspected persons. "It is a pity," writes Sir L. MATHEWS, "that Messrs. BURTT and ARMITAGE should be allowed to do as they pleased in the island of Pemba. They being British subjects, we are powerless to deal with them." In short, what they want in Zanzibar is a decree for the expulsion of all philanthropists.

The attitude of our officials in this part of Africa must be seen, as it can be seen in these letters, to be believed. Quite early in the correspondence we find the Council of the Protectorate quite upset by the Attorney General's opinion that, in accordance with that tradition of our childhood to which we have referred, it is illegal for a British subject to restore a fugitive Slave to his master, by the process imperturbably explained to the House of Commons last year by Mr. CURZON. Sir A. HARDINGE tells Lord SALISBURY that "the Council considered that the effect of this declaration might conceivably be serious, and that it was certainly somewhat embarrassing." No doubt it is embarrassing for British officials to administer a Mahometan law which is contrary to British law, but that, one would say, was a reason for accelerating the reform rather than retarding it by every possible means. But our officials appear to catch at every opportunity for delaying the change.

We have said enough to illustrate the official attitude of Slavery in East Africa. As to Lord SALISBURY's attitude, revealed in the concluding despatch, it is merely invertebrate. What he states as his own opinion will generally be found to be merely a shorter or weaker version of an opinion already expressed earlier in the correspondence by one of the officials on the spot. Lord SALISBURY proposes to go on upon the lines of last year's decree. That decree does not touch Slave-concubinage, nor does it affect Slavery on the mainland, though here the bottom has been knocked out of one of the pro-Slavery arguments by the energy of Bishop TUCKER in prosecuting a case on which we recently commented. Nothing will be done to accelerate matters as long as the present officials retain their positions."

From the "WESTERN DAILY PRESS," 26th July.

THE intricate problem of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba forms the subject of a newly-issued Parliamentary Paper. The jubilee year was marked by a proclamation that in the protected State of Zanzibar Slavery was abolished, and there was in consequence much rejoicing. But though there was cause for satisfaction, it now becomes necessary to admit that there is room for the moderation of transports over what was supposed to have been a great humanitarian declaration. According to the official report, Slavery in Zanzibar still exists. In the island of Zanzibar and in the adjoining island of Pemba, the manumissions since the jubilee proclamation have been numerous. That is all to the good. But in the mainland section of the Sultanate an end has not been made of servile labour, and, according to the despatches of Lord SALISBURY and Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, the British Consul, there is no immediate prospect of the complete destruction of the system. All qualifications apart, it therefore remains the fact that Slavery is sanctioned by the British Government, and that the protection of the British flag does not confer freedom on all Her Majesty's subjects outside the criminal classes. This is not as it should be, and it affords the reason why there should be in existence an ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY in England. That it should be

necessary to maintain such a society at the end of the nineteenth century constitutes, of itself, something of a reproach. But the existence of the organisation is more than justified, since its efforts are directed not only against those foreign nations and barbarous States which recognise the traffic in Slaves, but also against the government of a country which led the van of the emancipatory movement. It is not to be supposed that Lord SALISBURY himself likes the idea of having to give his consent to the maintenance of the institution of Slavery within any part of Her Majesty's dominions. To have to extend that approval must be humiliating, and Lord SALISBURY in the despatches now before Parliament, seems to adopt an apologetic attitude in defending himself against anticipated criticism. But the British Consul at Zanzibar is less thin-skinned. The tone of his despatches suggests that he is disposed to seek justification for the perpetuation of the system. He pleads expediency, and the difficulties and risks of interfering with the sanctions of the Moslem religion. No doubt some Slaves are more brutally treated than others; and it is quite credible that in some Mohammedan households the Slaves are far better off than certain classes of freemen both in that country and in this. But that is not quite the point. If the Slaves do not want to quit the service of a good master let them remain under his roof. What is necessary is that they should be at liberty to leave if they liked, and that they should, in fact, enjoy full freedom of contract. There should be no distinction in the enjoyment of the elementary right of the British subject, for as soon as nice adjustments are made, and delicately discriminating lines are drawn, the principle of freedom becomes undermined.

It is essential, therefore, to the dignity and the honour of the British Government that throughout the whole Protectorate of Zanzibar it shall be rendered impossible for any man to hold another in compulsory servitude—for one human being to regard the other as part of his goods and chattels.

PEMBA AND SLAVERY.

From the "FRIEND," July 29th.

THE pronouncement of our Prime Minister respecting the Friends' Industrial Mission in Pemba, in his despatch to Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE of the 29th of last month, claims the careful thought of the friends of the Slave. It seems to be anticipated that the attitude of the Friends' Mission in the island of Pemba, "by precipitating claims for freedom" on the part of the Slaves, and consequently for compensation on the part of the masters, may impose a heavier burden upon the Government in the near future. We wish to point out that this "heavier burden" is purely the result of the arrangement proposed by the Government to give compensation to owners of Slaves on their emancipation. No such arrangement was made in the far wider field in the abolition of the legal status of Slavery in India. No such arrangement was made in Africa in the recent abolition of Slavery in the Niger Protectorate. The arrangement was purely gratuitous in East Africa, and the only assumed apology for it lay in the advice given by Sir C. EVAN-SMITH to the SULTAN in 1890. As a matter of fact, only a very fractional part of the Slaves in the islands were *legally* held when the abolition of the legal status took place in 1897. But the arrangement for compensation has added immensely to the difficulties of officials, and has involved a very

serious additional burden on the administration. It is often almost impossible for the Commissioner to discover definitely whether a Slave owner has a legal claim for compensation or whether he has not. We objected to compensation, and are not responsible for the burden it is bringing on the Legislature. It is this compensation, not our presence in the island, which is complicating and delaying the arrangements for freedom. The right course now is to fix a time-limit, beyond which no Arab shall be entitled to enter any such claim. In the Parliamentary paper just issued, containing correspondence respecting the abolition of the legal status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba, Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE gives information up to April 23rd. He states that 2,000 had by that time obtained their freedom, and that 2,278 more had, without claiming papers of freedom, made contracts with their masters as free labourers. The sum awarded for compensation was £1,043, while charges for officials and for administration in connection with emancipation amount to another £9,000. Information respecting the position in Pemba is given up to June by a report from our good friend Mr. EDIB, the Acting Vice-Consul at Chaki-Chaki.

The presence of the Friends' Mission in the island of Pemba is recognised by the Prime Minister as "precipitating claims for freedom." Lord SALISBURY himself desires the freedom of the Slaves. The process of freedom in Pemba is certainly not advancing rapidly. So long as every application in the island has to pass through the hands of one Commissioner, who has other important duties devolving upon him, however willing he is to do the work, it must continue to be a very slow process. There can be no doubt that every Christian Mission in East Africa, whether of the Church Missionary Society, the Universities' Mission, or our own, has by its presence and activities an important influence in the direction of liberation. It is part of the programme of our Christian commission.

Instead, therefore, of seeing in this fact any cause of regret, we rejoice to have the evidence of our Prime Minister that the influence of the Friends' Mission is in this direction. As Slaves are set free, though it be but slowly, it becomes one of the important functions of our Mission to establish industrial enterprises in the island which shall provide sources of employment for those who are liberated, and thus develop the commercial capacities of the people. One of the greatest dangers of the situation has been the peculiar inaptitude of the Arabs to rouse themselves to the activities of commerce. They are so unused to work that they look to the Government for help instead of helping themselves. The Friends' Mission is on the spot to render the Government all the help it can with regard to the freedmen, if the Government will pass over to us able-bodied Africans, to train in industrial pursuits, to teach them to work for wages, to instil into them the advantages of self-support, that they may in fact, as well as in theory, become, as Miss Kingsley says, "the most valuable asset" of our Government in Africa.

From the "SPEAKER, July 30th.

THE correspondence which has just been presented to Parliament relating to Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba possesses a painful interest for every Englishman. It would seem that up till April last 1,167 Slaves in Zanzibar and 833 in Pemba, amounting altogether to the suspiciously round figure of 2,000, had been definitely freed, and that 2,278 more, without applying to the courts for freedom papers, had contracted with their masters to work as free labourers. The vast majority of the Slaves were therefore Slaves still, working as Slaves in a state of Slavery, though the legal status of Slavery had been for a year abolished. This extraordinary state of things is attributed by the officials to the desire of the Slaves themselves, who, it would seem, obstinately refuse to be freed. A phenomenon so strangely at variance with the result of emancipation decrees in all other countries needs, we believe, some further explanation. We do not attribute to the officials any conscious inhumanity, or any deliberate neglect of duty. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the Europeans among them are able and conscientious men, with an earnest desire to do everything which they conceive to be for the benefit of any section of the native population. The charges of dereliction of duty brought by the Friends' missionaries against the Arab Walis could not be substantiated, and they, too, must be admitted to be honest according to their lights. How, then, is the slow progress of emancipation to be explained? We can only reply that everything has proceeded precisely as we anticipated. The decree of April last was a trick practised by the Foreign Office on the British public. It has not abolished Slavery in Zanzibar because it was not intended to. The Slaves are not free because the law has not made them free. Lest there be any mistake, we will quote from the last report made by Mr. FARLER, the European responsible for the execution of the decrees in Pemba. Mr. FARLER is in Holy Orders, and was formerly attached to the Universities' Mission in Central Africa. He seems to be still known by his ecclesiastical title of Archdeacon, and to have carried into the tropics much of the hostility which clergymen of the Establishment so often feel towards dissent. He has, however, abandoned, at least for the time being, the clerical profession, and is a paid official of the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR. On March 14th last he wrote to his Chief, Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, and after repeating some Arab stories of thefts by Slaves, proceeds as follows:—

"In fact, the Slaves are under the belief that they are all to be freed, and that they need do no more work for their masters.

"All these Arabs were in despair about the future, and put down all their difficulties to the teaching of the Quaker missionaries of Banani.

"I told the Wali it was the wish of the Government that all thieves and vagrants should be severely dealt with, and that he must, after trial, imprison and punish with hard labour all who were convicted.

"The unrest among the Slaves is increasing, and it seems to me that the island is on the verge of being ruined. There will be no labour to gather the next clove crop,

and consequently poverty and misery will increase unless strong measures are taken. I see nothing else before us but terrible agrarian wars between Slaves and their masters."

To this Sir LLOYD MATHEWS replied :—

"With reference to your despatch of the 14th instant, referring to a deputation of Arabs having visited you and called your attention to the hostile attitude of their Slaves towards them, brought about by *the injudicious action of the Friends' Mission in spreading reports that all Slaves were to be emancipated*, I am of the opinion that the Arabs have possibly exaggerated their case, although I know that there is cause to expect complications in the future.

"I have, therefore, sent one of my most trustworthy officers to Pemba with a small party of selected police to patrol the plantations of the Arab deputation ; he has been instructed how to act, and will report fully on the matter."

We have taken the liberty of printing in italics one line in each of these despatches. The words seem to us to put the whole thing in a nutshell. The report that all Slaves were to be emancipated was incorrect, if not injudicious. The Government intended nothing of the sort. Indeed, this correspondence is full of official reasons why the Slaves should not be emancipated at once.

We absolutely refuse to reargue the question as to the expediency of immediate emancipation with Mr. FARLER, or with Sir LLOYD MATHEWS, or with Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, or with Lord SALISBURY. The question has been settled by the experience of mankind, by the public sentiment of all humane men, or by another method which ought not to be without its influence upon British administrators—that is to say, by the law of England. One valid excuse, and one only, can be urged to palliate delay. A government may not always be strong enough to put down Slavery at once. In the case of domestic Slavery in the African interior this excuse may be urged with some plausibility ; but Zanzibar and Pemba are absolutely under our power, and we could enforce any law we liked there without one hundredth part of the effort which we expended on the Indian Frontier last winter. In some countries the Slave-owners may plead that they are being deprived of property which they had legally acquired, but no such plea can be urged in Zanzibar. A quarter of a century ago Sir JOHN KIRK, who was then consul, persuaded the SULTAN to close the Slave market and prohibit the importation of Slaves.

From the "ECHO," August 6th.

WE are exceedingly glad that, last night, Sir CHARLES DILKE moved, and Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT supported a motion to reduce Sir A. HARDINGE's salary, in order to draw attention to the question of Slavery at Zanzibar. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE is Her Majesty's Representative there. The Attorney-General, Sir RICHARD WEBSTER, has laid it down that it is absolutely unlawful for a British subject to detain, or be concerned in detaining, a Slave under any circumstances whatever. When that opinion

was transmitted to Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, and the Council met under his presidency to consider the message from the Foreign Office, Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE said that the declaration of the Attorney-General "would greatly strengthen the missionaries in the neighbourhood of Mombasa in their practice of encouraging the Slaves to leave their masters, and settle on the mission lands," a proceeding which he evidently regards with very great disfavour. One would have thought that everyone with a drop of English blood in him would have heartily supported the Attorney-General's dictum. But, unfortunately, there are amongst us some people who, though of English parentage, are quite un-English in their social ideals, who regard Slavery with complacency, and to whom the word "freedom" conveys no noble inspiration. To such a class Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE seems to belong. What is appalling is that Mr. CURZON should speak in regard to the matter as he did last night. This is what he said: "To the statement made by the Leader of the House, a year ago, in regard to the abolition of Slavery on the mainland, the Government adhered, and they hoped to carry out there the same measure of abolition as they were successfully carrying out in the islands; but it was necessary to wait to see what the result of the experiment that had been made would be, what would be its political effects, and what would be the probable cost of the policy." Shades of WILBERFORCE and GRANVILLE SHARP! And this man calls himself an Englishman, and is a Minister of the Crown! Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT well said last night that Mr. CURZON's language was "the sort of language which preceded the Civil War in America." *Absit omen.*

From the "CHRISTIAN," August 4th.

ACCORDING to a Parliamentary paper just published, the abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar is proceeding but slowly. Out of the scores of thousands of Slaves in that region only 4,278 had been emancipated by April of the present year. On the mainland the legal status of Slavery, for reasons satisfactory to the Government, has not even yet been abolished. This half-hearted and piecemeal policy is altogether out of keeping with the times, and will need unceasing vigilance if it is to issue in real emancipation. The reason of the slow progress of the movement is the fact that the initiative is laid on the Slave; and when we realise the low condition and dense ignorance of these poor creatures it is no wonder that they are so slow to recognise and exercise their rights. Unless more is done to educate them and champion their rights, it will be a long time before their freedom will be gained.

From the "DAILY CHRONICLE," August 6th.

THE most important question that came up during the Supply discussions was the Zanzibar Slavery question, which was raised on the Vote for Foreign Missions and Embassies after eleven o'clock. Sir CHARLES DILKE moved the reduction of Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE's salary, and Mr. CURZON made another of

his unfortunate pro-Slavery speeches. His defence of the status of Slavery on the mainland was, indeed, modified by a vague promise of extending the abolition of Slavery. But that is in the remote future. He refuses to take any further steps at present, and last night he continued his attacks on the missionaries, hashing up Sir ARTHUR's charge of a breach of some vague promise. Mr. LABOUCHERE pointed out that the missionaries on the spot, like Bishop TUCKER, knew more about the matter than the Church Missionary Society in London. But apart from these arguments, what is inexcusable is the tone of levity, the sneers on good men, and the empty laughter that Mr. CURZON displayed throughout the debate last night. Mr. CURZON enjoyed himself thoroughly. But perhaps he will discover before the end that it is no laughing matter, for his own followers showed a very different mood. While he held his sides they sat silent, and the debate gradually became more and more serious for the Government. Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT called attention to the highly improper despatch in which Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE refers to the efforts of the missionaries to give the fugitive Slaves occupation, and declared his intention of voting for the reduction. Mr. GEDGE denied, on behalf of the Church Missionary Society, that any pledge had been given, and declared their unalterable confidence in Bishop TUCKER. Mr. DALZIEL made a spirited attack on Mr. CHAMBERLAIN; and Commander BETHELL made but a half-hearted defence of the Government. A few more such performances of Mr. CURZON's will cost them dear.

The African Association.

ITS AIMS AND OBJECTS.

THIS Association, deeply sensible of the absence of any body of Africans in England representing native opinion in national matters affecting the destiny of the African race, do organise itself for the following purposes and objects:—

“To encourage a feeling of unity to facilitate friendly intercourse among Africans in general; to promote and protect the interests of all subjects claiming African descent, wholly or in part, in British Colonies and other places, especially in Africa, by circulating accurate information on all subjects affecting their rights and privileges as subjects of the British Empire, by direct appeals to the Imperial and Local Governments.”

The above is the opening page of a pamphlet containing the rules of the newly-formed African Association, whose Secretary, Mr. H. SILVESTER WILLIAMS, of Trinidad, we have had the pleasure of meeting. With one or two exceptions, all the officers and the committee hail from the West Indies, but several gentlemen belonging to the Aborigines' Protection Society have become honorary members of the Association. We are pleased to give our hearty good wishes to this newly-formed body, and to state that all persons wishing information about its rules and objects may address Mr. H. S. WILLIAMS, Common Room, Gray's Inn, W.C.

Parliamentary Debate on Slavery on the Zanzibar Mainland.

(By permission from the "TIMES.")

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 5th August.

On the vote to complete the sum of £491,600 for embassies and missions abroad and for Consular establishments abroad,

Sir C. DILKE moved the reduction of the salary of Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, Her Majesty's Representative in Zanzibar, by £100, in order to call attention to the handing over of fugitive Slaves to their masters by British officers and police on the coast strip in violation of the first principles of English law. The Attorney-General had laid it down that it was absolutely unlawful for a British subject to detain, or be concerned in detaining, a Slave under any circumstances whatever. The leader of the House undertook last year that it should be made clear to all engaged in administration on the spot that no breach of the law as laid down by the Attorney-General would be permitted. But the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs recently told the House that it had been impossible to perform this undertaking. On the 18th of February the Under-Secretary referred to the pledge given the previous year, and said that the conditions as regards the mainland were not favourable, and that he must wait for the result of the experiment on the islands. Then he gave as a reason why the conditions were unfavourable—"the temptations held out by the missionaries to induce the Slaves to run away from their masters and settle on the mission lands." There they were back again to the position they were in before the statement of the Attorney-General and the declaration of the leader of the House. On July 5 of last year the council met under the presidency of Sir A. HARDINGE to consider the telegram sent by the Foreign Office after the pledge of the leader of the House. At that meeting Mr. DE SAUSMAREZ expressed the opinion that the Attorney-General's declaration, however weighty, in view of his position as an exposition of English law, and however binding on executive officers in their executive capacity, could not be regarded as a legal decision obliging a judicial officer sitting judicially to deny to a suitor the benefits of the local law he was appointed to administer. That was the document by which the Foreign Office had reverted to its original doctrine and practice. Sir A. HARDINGE gave his own view that the declaration of the Attorney-General "would greatly strengthen the missionaries in the neighbourhood of Mombasa in their practice of encouraging the Slaves to leave their masters and settle on the mission lands." There was the origin of the Under-Secretary's statement, there was the real origin of the doctrine, and on that ground he moved the reduction of Sir A. HARDINGE's salary. Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE had succeeded in defeating the House, the injunction of the leader of the House,

and the *dictum* of the Attorney-General, while the position of the question had been brought back to that which it occupied before the debate took place.

Mr. CURZON said that a drawback of these Foreign Office debates which arose on the Consular and Diplomatic Vote was that the spokesman for the time being of the department had to range over the whole sphere of the service, while, unless by the courtesy of the hon. member who proposed to raise a particular question, it was impossible for the representative of the department to prepare a defence.

Sir C. DILKE.—I communicated with the Whips several days ago that I intended to raise this question.

Mr. CURZON said that at any rate this warning had not reached him ; and although he heard that the right hon. gentleman intended to raise a point in connection with Uganda, he had no idea whatever that the particular topic on which he wished to arraign the Foreign Office was the conduct of Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE and the Government with reference to the question of Slavery in Zanzibar. If, therefore, he had not at his disposal the whole of the material necessary to give a satisfactory reply to the right hon. baronet he hoped that the Committee would understand the difficult position in which he was placed. (Hear, hear.) He disputed entirely the two propositions which he understood formed the basis of the right hon. gentleman's attack. It was said, in the first place, that the *dictum* of the Attorney-General last year, on which the Government had taken action, had been subsequently disregarded and ignored by them, and, led by Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, the Government had been tempted or persuaded into a complete reversal of their policy and a violation of their promise with regard to the ten-mile strip of coast. He disputed both of these propositions. The *dictum* of the Attorney-General was telegraphed out to Zanzibar, and it strictly defined the conduct, attitude, and obligations of British officers engaged in the discharge of their duties in that ten-mile strip. It had been consistently acted upon since, and he knew of no case in which it had been violated.

Captain BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) : British officer or British subject ?

Mr. CURZON said there was no distinction in form between the two. The *dictum* of the Attorney-General applied to British subjects who were acting in the position of officers, and he challenged the right hon. gentleman to cite a case in which a British officer had since violated the law laid down by the Attorney-General. The right hon. gentleman seemed to think that in the remarks which he made on the missionaries in the speech delivered in February last that he had indicated on the part of the Government some sympathy with the violation of this *dictum* of the Attorney-General. When he referred to the missionaries, making no reference to the action of British officers in connection with fugitive Slaves at all, he was referring to a fact which had been brought out more than once in the Blue Book, that the attitude of the missionaries in persuading Slaves to run away from their

masters and take refuge in mission stations was an action distinctly in violation of the engagements entered into by the missionaries themselves. These engagements were recorded in the Blue Book ; they had been consistently observed for a number of years by the missionaries, and it was not until last year that they openly broke the engagements entered into. Their action was most unfair to the land owners whose Slaves cultivated their estates and were thereby drawn away. To the statement made by the leader of the House a year ago in regard to the abolition of Slavery on the mainland the Government adhered, and they hoped to carry out there the same measure of abolition as they were successfully carrying out in the islands ; but it was necessary to wait to see what the result of the experiment that had been made would be, what would be its political effects, and what would be the probable cost of the policy. The cost of the judicial procedure which the Government had set up amounted to £12,000 a year, and he anticipated that before long it might be necessary to ask for further assistance from Parliament. The Government did not think it wise at present to throw upon the shoulders of their officials the enormous responsibility, and to incur the great cost that would be entailed if a similar course were pursued on the mainland to that which had been pursued in the Islands. The whole experience of the past taught them that they must be very careful how they handled these questions on the mainland. Two years ago and last year it had fallen to his lot to make statements with regard to rebellions and rumours of war in that quarter of the world, and since then there had been the serious outbreak in Uganda. There was now a serious trouble a little further north, and the Government, having a full consciousness of the responsibilities imposed upon them, were unwilling to add to these responsibilities by incurring the risk of any fresh outbreak or disturbance on the mainland. The promises which the Government had given they adhered to, but they did not intend to be hurried in their action by any appeals or charges which might be made in that House upon an imperfect knowledge of the facts of case.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) expressed dissatisfaction with the reply of the Under-Secretary. He wished to ask the right hon. gentleman whether the Government were prepared to protect British missionaries and British subjects who gave protection to runaway Slaves in British territory. A few years ago we forced a SULTAN on the people of Zanzibar by the force of our ships which were in those waters, for the purpose of suppressing the Slave-trade. Yet that SULTAN was allowed to take over 20,000 Slaves. He would like to know how many of those Slaves Sir A. HARDINGE had insisted on freeing.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said the Under-Secretary had said that we ought to await the result of the experiment in Zanzibar, and if that experiment succeeded the freedom of the Slaves on this strip of the mainland was to be undertaken. He remembered an eloquent speech of the Secretary for the

Colonies, in which he protested against that doctrine, when put forward by his hon. friend the late Under-Secretary. (Hear, hear.) If they did not obtain another speech from the Secretary for the Colonies, he had no doubt they would find him voting with them. This was a question which concerned the national honour and good name in the world. Was this a British Protectorate? The right hon. gentleman laughed at the idea. The idea of freeing Slaves was monstrous to him. (Hear, hear.) In the right hon. gentleman's view, they ought to remain in Slavery, until an experiment had been made elsewhere. The right hon. gentleman said these Slaves were so wicked as to attempt to free themselves, and that the missionaries had committed the execrable crime of refusing to give up the Slaves. The right hon. gentleman said the missionaries ought to take the Slaves by the neck, and drag them before a Court of Law. (Hear.)

Mr. CURZON: The whole of the hon. gentleman's speech is a grotesque and comical travesty of what I said. I never said the missionaries ought to do anything of the sort.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said the right hon. gentleman laid it down that the Church Missionary Society was under some engagement, but the Bishop repudiated this obligation, and he protested against it. No man there ought to return a fugitive Slave. If a fugitive Slave took refuge, he could conceive nothing more monstrous or iniquitous than to take that man and return him to his masters. (Hear, hear.) Let it go out to the country, as the finale of that Session, that the Government said that, notwithstanding the opinion of the Attorney-General, Slavery ought to exist under a British Protectorate.

Sir W. HARCOURT: I cannot help thinking that the tone which the Under-Secretary has adopted, not for the first time, is an unfortunate tone—(cheers)—and does not correspond to the feelings of the House or of the country. (Hear, hear.) I protested earlier in the Session against what I have called the unhappy attack on Bishop TUCKER.

Mr. CURZON: No attack.

Sir W. HARCOURT: Now, I think I shall certainly vote for the reduction of the vote. I must refer to the despatch of Sir A. HARDINGE on July 5th, 1897. My opinion is that the language there used on the subject of Slavery is entirely unworthy of the man who represents the British crown and the British people. In this despatch he says:—

"I informed the council of the recent declaration made in Parliament by the Attorney-General and communicated to me in your lordship's telegram of the 26th ultimo respecting the restoration to their masters of fugitive Slaves. The council considered that the effect of this declaration might conceivably be serious, and that it was certainly somewhat embarrassing, as it made it illegal for British officials in the province of Seyyidieh and Tanaland to enforce the Mahomedan *lex loci* respecting Slavery which,

until it was formally repealed, the native Courts, even those presided over by British Judges, could with difficulty refuse to administer."

Then there is this further: "The declaration of the Attorney-General would greatly strengthen the missionaries in the neighbourhood of Mombasa in their practice of encouraging Slaves to leave their masters and settle on mission lands by better terms than any native landowner could afford to offer them." The despatch proceeds: "Was there any means by which we could, even though only perhaps in a limited degree, protect the native population indirectly, if we were precluded from doing so directly, against the unfair competition of the missions—with all their capital and influence—in the native labour market, and prevent the mission stations from being converted into chartered sanctuaries for lazy or vagabond Slaves?" I protest against that language being used by the representative of the British Crown. (Cheers.) That was the sort of language which preceded the Civil War in America. In my opinion that despatch, considering the spirit in which it is couched, is one that ought to be condemned, and if there is a division I will vote with my hon. friend. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CURZON: I have only one sentence to say, if the Committee will allow me, in reply to the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman must be unaware of or must have forgotten an incident that happened in the career of his own Government when he censures Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE for enforcing the Mahomedan *lex loci*.

Sir W. HARCOURT: I did not censure him for that.

Mr. CURZON: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon; that was his whole point.

Sir W. HARCOURT: I condemned the spirit in which he referred to the Attorney-General's declaration as an interference between British officers in carrying out the law and an encouragement to the missionaries to protect the Slaves. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CURZON: Yes; but more than that, the question upon which we have been arraigned is whether the Mahomedan *lex loci* ought or ought not to be maintained pending new arrangements. Why, the very last act of the late Government, of which the right hon. gentleman was the leader in this House, on the day before they quitted office, was a telegram sent by Lord KIMBERLEY to Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE, who at that time was taking over on behalf of Her MAJESTY the protectorate of the mainland of Zanzibar, authorising him to give an assurance to the natives that the religious law of Islam, under which Slavery is the *lex loci* of the locality, should be maintained. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. CLARK thought that the officials who refused to loyally carry out the decisions of the House ought to be dismissed. (Hear, hear.)

Captain BETHELL said that whatever Sir ARTHUR HARDINGE might do would not alter the British law. From the fact that the present Government and the late Government had found such difficulty in effecting this change

it was obvious that the difficulty and responsibility of carrying it out was greater than they had supposed.

Mr. DALZIEL said the members of the present Government, when they were in Opposition, did not admit when they criticized the late Government how difficult it was to deal with this matter. The right hon. member for West Birmingham, speaking on March 8, 1895, said it was a public disgrace that Slavery should exist under the British flag and that it was quite time it should come to an end. It had not come to an end, however, and they were at the present moment countenancing, defending, and agreeing to a state of things by which Slavery was allowed to continue under the British flag. This matter was made a question of a vote of want of confidence five years ago, and yet the right hon. member for West Birmingham and others, who then censured the late Government and insisted on a policy which would abolish Slavery, were now going to support the present Government, although practically nothing of real value had been done to carry out the policy they then enunciated so strongly. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. J. WILSON (York, W. R., Holmfirth) observed that dissatisfaction had been caused on previous occasions by the fact that the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, with more or less flippancy of manner, had justified, or palliated, or made light of Slavery in a way that was not consistent with the traditions of the British people or of that House. (Hear, hear.) He had again listened with regret to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, and when at last he got to a kind of climax and spoke of unfairness to landowners then it was that many members shared the feeling that they had got to a pretty climax indeed when the question of human freedom was discussed on the point whether landowners should treat human beings as if they were on a level with cattle. (Hear, hear.) He had no intention of continuing the discussion, but could not refrain from expressing his very strong feeling that whatever were the difficulties of this question they ought to be treated with the utmost possible gravity, and it was painful to hear any palliation of the idea that there should be an absolute property in human beings. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BALFOUR said there was no desire to treat this question in any manner other than as it should be treated, and the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had expressed but the commonplace belief that permeated every section of political and social life in the House and the country. (Hear, hear.) He did not rise to continue the discussion, but to suggest that now, after a division, the vote should be taken, that the House might proceed with the important business before it.

Sir C. DILKE said they were perfectly ready to take a division, but he understood there was another matter to be raised in connection with the vote.

Mr. GEDGE (Walsall) regretted his hon. friend the member for the Honiton Division was not in his place. His hon. friend was president of the Church Missionary Society, and would have spoken from that position. As

a vice-president, in the absence of his hon. friend, he could say that the society had no knowledge of any such pledge as had been mentioned. They had the utmost confidence in Bishop TUCKER, a man of moderation and of calm, fair-judging mind. He was not a man to take up the part of a zealot or enthusiast; he was thoroughly acquainted with the whole subject, and his impartiality could be absolutely relied upon.

The Committee divided—

For the reduction	55
Against it	119
Majority against	—64

The CHAIRMAN was about to put the vote, when

Mr. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) said he had given notice of a motion to move a reduction of the vote and to raise a question of considerable importance to his constituents, but at that late hour, and in view of other business to come before them, he would postpone his motion if he could have another opportunity.

Mr. BALFOUR said his hon. friend would have an opportunity on the report of Supply on Monday. The votes in supply would be closed at 10 o'clock.

The vote was agreed to.

[We wish that Bishop TUCKER and his faithful band of missionaries would advise some of the Slaves on the Zanzibar Mainland to follow up the test action of April 25th by boldly demanding their freedom.

Judge CRAUFURD on that occasion gave freedom to the Slave-girl, HERI KARIBU, on the ground that she had been brought into the territory as a raw Slave, subsequent to the Proclamation of 1876, and that therefore she was illegally held.

There must be many thousands of Slaves on the long ten-mile strip, which is now rented by Great Britain from the SULTAN, who have been brought there since 1876, and who are therefore illegally held in bondage. Let them be advised to sue their masters, *in forma pauperis*, in the Commissioner's Court, and claim their freedom. This would save the Government from the expense of a general abolition, which they seem so much to dread.]

The Slave-Trade on the Arabian Coast.

A PERFECTLY OPEN TRAFFIC.

THE *Times of India*, commenting on the seizure of a Slave dhow, which was recently taken into Muscat by H.M.S. *Sphinx*, says:—The incident affords an opportunity for reviewing the condition of the Slave-trade as carried on upon the coasts of Oman at the present day. For many years past Slaves have been conveyed in large numbers from Zanzibar, and other ports on the East African coast, in order to supply the demand in the whole of Oman and its neighbouring countries, and also to supply the large number of divers who are required to carry on the pearl fisheries on the Persian Gulf. This latter work is particularly arduous, and requires the very highest physical qualities of endurance if the unfortunate diver wishes to survive many seasons. In spite of the suitability of the climate and water to the diver's physical needs, very few of these unfortunate Slaves long survive the prolonged exertions which they are compelled by their Arab masters to undertake. The weaker men soon die, and a large annual number of recruits is necessary for this cause alone.

BRITISH EFFORTS TO STOP THE TRADE.

With the institution of domestic Slavery Great Britain made no attempt to deal, as it is so intimately associated with the religious and domestic life of the Arabs, that any attempt to interfere with the system would undoubtedly arouse the most determined hostility, and would be resisted to the bitter end. The method adopted to suppress the Slave-trade consisted of an undertaking obtained from the SULTAN of Muscat—in exchange for material benefits accorded to him—by which he promised to abolish Slave markets in his dominions. Treaties were also signed with the chiefs of the Pirate Coasts. Simultaneously with these arrangements, efforts were made by an energetic patrol of the coasts by men-of-war at the ports of arrival and departure, to render the trade so difficult and unsafe that it could not be carried on profitably, and so would eventually be practically suppressed. This result has not, however, been reached, and Slavery is at the present time carried on perfectly openly on the whole of the coasts in question.

JEALOUSY OF THE FRENCH.

This is unhappily due mainly to the fact that the French Government would not endorse the action of its plenipotentiaries at the Brussels Conference, and also to the unfortunate fact that the French flag has, in a spirit of jealousy and with a desire to undermine British influence among the Arabs, been granted in an indiscriminate manner to the owners and captains of Arab craft. As the French men-of-war do little or no effective cruising in these waters, the Arab—quick to take advantage of anything likely to suit his purpose—has on many occasions used the French flag merely to enable

him to run cargoes of Slaves in safety, trusting that the well-known objection of the French to allow any dhow carrying their flag to be searched, or even boarded, would suffice to protect them from any too inquisitive British cruiser.

DHOWS FLYING THE FRENCH FLAG.

To such a pitch has this trade attained, that it is a fact which can hardly be disputed that from 1,500 to 2,000 Slaves annually are landed at Sur alone. This place is practically the headquarters of the Slave-trade, and a large proportion of the dhows owned at Sur have managed to acquire the right to fly the French flag. We assert, without fear of contradiction, that many of these Slaves are carried under the protection of the French flag. Sur, while the largest place of import, is by no means the only one, as it is well known that Slaves are landed at many other ports on the Coast. Generally, large dhows only are run to Sur, and the Slaves are then distributed in smaller vessels along the coast. The Slaves who are despatched to the pearl fishery, and to supply the numerous towns on the pirate coast, are sent by caravan from Sur to their destination, as it is a much shorter journey by land than by sea.

A DISGRACE TO EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION.

That this trade should be carried on openly—as it is—and that any feelings of jealousy and petty bickering between two great Powers should enable the Arab Slave-dealer to pursue his infamous calling with impunity, is a disgrace to European civilization, and the public of both countries—did they know the facts—would with one accord call upon their respective Governments to come to some understanding by means of which this state of affairs should be ended, and the Arab Slaver, in this as in other parts of the world, cleared once for all from the surface of the seas.

Note. The above information confirms what we have frequently stated, that the mere prospect of abolition has largely increased the export of Slaves from Zanzibar and Pemba to the Arabian coast, and this will continue so long as the British Government refuses to carry out an immediate and unconditional abolition of Slavery in these islands.

ACTIVITY OF SLAVE-TRADE BETWEEN PEMBA AND ARABIA.

We have seen many notices in different newspapers of late of an increase in the Slave-trade between Pemba and Arabia, a fact of which we took note when the prospect of an Abolition Decree was imminent, eighteen months ago. The following extract from a letter from Sir A. HARDINGE, dated June, 1897, gives official confirmation to these reports:—

“On the other hand, I believe a lot of Slaves have been shipped to Muscat on French dhows, since the Decree, by Arabs who have no stake

in the country here, and some to the German coast. Meyer, the Governor of Tanga, told me when I was down at Jasin in May that a lot of Pemba Arabs had come over, and asked to be allowed to migrate with their Slaves to German territory, but, he said he would only give them land, if they surrendered or sold their estates in Pemba, as he did not want subjects owning a double allegiance, with one foot in the English and the other in the German Protectorates. They thought this not good enough, and went back to their own homes."

Slave-Raiders Punished.

DEATH OF CAPTAIN GOLDIE TAUBMAN.

AKASSA, July 7.

FOUR hundred men of the Niger Company's forces, with machine guns, have attacked the Emirs of Lapai and Argeyes, tributary Princes of Sokoto, in their strongholds, the Emirs having refused to obey the Company's rules against Slave-raiding.

Both Lapai and Argeyes were captured, the British loss being *nil*, and that of the enemy considerable. The Foulahs are fleeing north to Sokoto.

Captain GOLDIE TAUBMAN died of fever, on June 23, and Colour-Sergeant PAYNE on June 29.—*Reuter's Special Service*.

The Foulah Slave-raiders, who are Mohammedans, were driven out of Southern Nupé by the Company's forces early in 1897, and in June of that year Slavery was declared abolished. The Emirs of Nupé and Ilorin were severely punished for Slave-raiding in the same year.

We offer our sincere sympathies to Sir GEORGE TAUBMAN GOLDIE on the premature death of his young nephew.—ED., *Reporter*.

Banani.

BY HENRY STANLEY NEWMAN.

The writer of this interesting little volume has pointed out to us that in our Review of his book we have stated that the name of Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE is not alluded to, although he was the pioneer of the work now carried on in Pemba. We regret that, owing to Mr. DONALD MACKENZIE's name not being found in the Index, although that of GEORGE S. MACKENZIE, late of the British East African Company, occurs twice, the single mention of the former gentleman's name, on page 164, escaped our notice. With that exception our paragraph on page 44 of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* is absolutely correct.